

# The Inquirer.

A Journal of Liberal Religious Thought and Life.

ESTABLISHED IN 1842.]

[REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER.

No. 3488.  
NEW SERIES, No. 592.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1909.

[ONE PENNY.

## CONTENTS.

NOTES OF THE WEEK...	314
<b>National Conference—</b>	
LEADER:—The National Conference	289
CONFERENCE DISCUSSIONS:—	
I.—The Problem of Evil	291
II.—The Wider Meaning of Modernism	291
III.—Reform of the Poor Law	292
IV.—Our Congregations: Their Worship, Membership, and Organisation	293
The Ministry as a Vocation	294
The Conference Sermon	297
The Problem of Evil	300
The Wider Meaning of Modernism:	
I. 303; II. 306	
The Public Meeting	309
The Sustentation Fund	313
National Conference Committee Nominations	290
ARTICLES:—	
Dr. S. A. Eliot at Oxford	315
In the Academy	315
In the Crow's Nest	316
LITERATURE:—	
One of Our Singers	318
OBITUARY:—	
Mr. James Parsons, F.G.S.	316
Mr. J. B. Wostinholm	316
THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN	317
NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES	318

## NATIONAL CONFERENCE. SPECIAL NUMBER—II.

### The Week's Programme. APRIL 19-23.

- Monday.**—Guilds' Union Meetings.  
7.30 Young People's Rally.
- Tuesday.**—12.30, Pensions Fund Meeting.  
3.45, Social Service Union.  
4.0, President's Reception.  
4.30, Business Meeting, I.  
7.30, Religious Service. Sermon by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.
- Wednesday.**—9.30, Communion Service.  
10.30, President's Address.  
11.30, Conference ("The Problem of Evil"). Professor Henry Jones (Glasgow).  
2.30, Business Meeting, II.  
7.30, Conversazione.
- Thursday.**—9.30, Religious Service. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. S. A. Eliot (President, A.U.A.).  
11.0, Conference ("The Wider Meaning of Modernism"). The Revs. J. M. Lloyd Thomas and J. W. Austin.  
2.30, Conference ("Reform of the Poor Law"). Mrs. Bosanquet and the Rev. Percy Dearmer.  
7.30, Public Meeting.
- Friday.**—9.30, Service of Consecration.  
10.15, Conference ("Our Congregations"). The Revs. F. K. Freeston and J. Harwood.  
12.80, Address on "The Ministry as a Vocation," by the Rev. Dr. J. Edwin Odgers.

## THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE. THE BOLTON MEETINGS.

THE tenth triennial meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian, Liberal Christian, Free Christian, Presbyterian, and other Non-subscribing or kindred congregations, held at Bolton last week, and fully recorded in our two special numbers, of which this is the second, was from first to last a splendid success. The gratitude of the Conference to the friends at Bolton for their most admirable arrangements and generous hospitality was warmly expressed at the closing meeting, and the Rev. Henry Gow, in moving the resolution of thanks, also expressed the general feeling as to the high level of the speaking maintained throughout the week, and the inspiration of the great gatherings. Numbers are always difficult to estimate, but careful observers familiar with the ground have reckoned that there were about 1,200 at the Tuesday evening service in the Town Hall, and not many less than that at the Wednesday evening conversazione (another estimate says considerably more), while for the public meeting on Thursday evening the number is put at 1,600. At the Wednesday morning communion service in Bank-street Chapel the numbers were not far short of 400, and for the morning and afternoon sessions of the Conference the attendances ranged from 350 to 800 or more. The one definite figure is the number of voting papers handed in by ministers and delegates present for the committee election, and that was 291, but a good many did not vote. We are informed that 437 ministers and delegates accepted invitations for hospitality and luncheons, so that it is safe to say that well over 350 were present at some or all of the meetings.

Our record has been, of necessity, somewhat unchronological, but the two sermons and the papers are all here, and a full report of the speeches at the public meeting, which was at least one high-water mark in the eloquence and enthusiasm of the week; another was at the close of the paper on Modernism by the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, when for the first time the Conference, deeply stirred, broke out not only into long continued applause, but unmistakable cheers; and

this was repeated on Thursday afternoon—though not with the same intensity—after the paper on Poor Law Reform by the Rev. Percy Dearmer. It was, doubtless, the social enthusiasm of the younger men which thus found significant and refreshing utterance. We have also this week a report, as full as space and capacity would permit, of the discussions on the various papers. These, which are given all together, can easily be appended to their several papers.

The services of devotion were all most helpful. We have already referred to the glorious outpouring of the hymns at the Tuesday evening service, and the singing of "Forward be our watch-word!" at the close of the public meeting was hardly less heart-stirring. The Tuesday service, which was conducted by the Rev. H. D. Roberts, of Hope-street Church, Liverpool, we shall not soon forget. At the Wednesday communion service in Bank-street Chapel, the address was given by the Rev. J. Collins Odgers, the Rev. H. J. Rossington taking part with him in the service, while in the distribution the Revs. W. H. Lambelle, T. Arthur Thomas, J. H. Weatherall and Jeffery Worthington, and Messrs. J. J. Bradshaw, John Dendy, John Harrison, and T. Fletcher Robinson, assisted. It is interesting to note that for this service communion plate was kindly lent by the Ainsworth, Bury, Chowbent, Rochdale, and Stand congregations, in addition to that of the Bank-street congregation itself. The service on Thursday morning, when Dr. Eliot preached, was conducted by the Rev. N. Anderton, of Monton. The service of consecration on Friday morning was in the hands of the Revs. W. Whitaker and Herbert McLachlan, the former giving the address. At these morning services in the Town Hall, Mr. John Harrison kindly officiated at the organ.

We have gladly borne the labour of furnishing these reports and publishing at once the sermons and papers of the week. We are conscious of a great wealth of thought, of powerful appeal and inspiration concerning the things which most deeply affect our peace and the welfare of our churches and this nation, and also of matter demanding quiet and careful reading and consideration, all gathered



together in these pages. The pennies of the market will not, of course, pay for them; this is largely a free gift offered to the churches, in the interest of our common cause, and we may fairly ask that the record of these two Conference numbers may be not only widely distributed, but also seriously read.

#### THANKS TO BOLTON FRIENDS.

The resolution of thanks passed at the closing session of the Conference on Friday morning was as follows:—

"That at this closing meeting the members of the National Conference return their warmest thanks to the Bolton congregation for the abounding hospitality of their reception; to the members of neighbouring congregations and of other communions for so generously opening their houses to receive them; to the local Ministers, Committee, and Officers, and especially the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. Alfred Pilling and Mr. Percy Taylor, for their unwearying and most successful efforts to provide for the comfort of their guests; to the Mayor of Bolton and to the minister and officers of the Mawdsley-street Congregational Church for their special courtesy; to the friends who have provided the music; and to all who have in any way contributed to the success of the Conference."

The Rev. HENRY GOW, who moved the resolution, said that was no mere formal vote of thanks; it expressed their deep and thankful joy for the meetings in which they had been privileged to take part, and for all the help given by their Bolton friends to make the meetings as successful as they had been. The chairman on the previous evening had truly spoken of the kind hearts and hospitable homes of Bolton. Many of them had long known it; now with one accord they felt it with a most sincere and perfect sympathy. Having made special reference to the admirable work of the secretaries, and to the debt of gratitude they also owed to the Rev. J. H. Weatherall, the minister of Bank-street Chapel, Mr. Gow went on to say that he had attended all the Conferences from the first, and that was the finest of them all. They had sat at the feet of their older and revered teachers, whom they had heard on other occasions, and always heard with the deepest pleasure; but that was essentially a Conference of young men. They had felt a new power in the brilliant talents of some of the younger men, and had been greatly encouraged by their words. And even more encouraging was the fact of their presence in our midst, that they were working in our churches in various parts of the country. No one again could speak with any truth of the coldness or want of power in public meeting of their ministers. They would leave those meetings with deep encouragement and joy, and they desired to record their gratitude to the friends who had done so much to make the meetings a joy and help to them all.

Mr. J. T. PERRY of Nottingham, who seconded, spoke of the Conference as splendid and inspiring, and warmly acknowledged the generous hospitality and excellent arrangements of their friends. It meant expenditure not only of money, but of thought and care and self-sacrifice.

Their friends in Bolton had set them an example, which it would be difficult to follow.

The PRESIDENT, in putting the resolution, added his own word of warm gratitude and acknowledgment. It had been to all of them a time of refreshing. The goodwill and kindness and sympathy shown by everyone concerned had touched them very deeply.

The resolution was very heartily carried.

Mr. JOHN HARWOOD, chairman of the local Committee, acknowledging the vote, paid a tribute to the secretaries and their minister as the essential men on whom the real burden of work had fallen. The advantage, he said, lay with them. Who could be at such meetings without feeling determined to do a little more than they had done before in the service of the cause? That had been the dominating note, more self-sacrifice.

Mr. ALFRED PILLING also responded, and said their thanks were due to large numbers of helpers, who had given thought and labour for months past to those arrangements. They had been confident it would bring them a refreshing experience, and their brightest anticipations had been realised. It had been one of the happiest experiences of their lives.

The Conference would not be satisfied without a word also from the Rev. J. H. WEATHERALL and Mr. PERCY TAYLOR, the other hon. secretary, and they both shared in the acknowledgments. Mr. Weatherall said that at first he had thought it impossible for Bolton to have the Conference; but after four years' experience of Bolton people he had faith in them, and his faith had been abundantly justified.

On this resolution followed the final address on "The Ministry as a Vocation," by the Rev. Dr. J. Edwin Odgers, a most timely and helpful utterance, for which all who have the welfare of our ministry at heart must be grateful to Dr. Odgers. The closing hymn was Samuel Longfellow's:—

"O still, in accents sweet and strong,  
Sounds forth the ancient word—  
'More reapers for white harvest fields,  
More labourers for the Lord!'"

And the final Benediction was pronounced by the President, the Rev. Joseph Wood, who thereupon relinquished the office to which he has given such devoted service, in the interest of our churches throughout the land. The Rev. H. Enfield Dowson is now President.

#### THE NEW COMMITTEE.

To the report of the business meeting there is one addition to be made. According to the rules of the Conference twelve members of Committee are to be elected by ballot at each triennial meeting, from a list of previously nominated members. The President appointed Mr. G. W. Rayner Wood and the Rev. Gordon Cooper scrutineers for this election at Bolton, and on the Friday morning the result was declared as follows:—

Elected members of new Committee: Rev. Dendy Agate, Rev. E. D. Priestley Evans, Rev. Alfred Hall, Mr. John Harrison, Mr. John Lawson, Rev. Charles Peach, Rev. Charles Roper, Rev. C. J. Street, Mr. A. S. Thew, Mr. J. C. Warren, Rev. J. H. Weatherall, Mr. J. Wigley.

This was a remarkable, but not, perhaps unexpected result, owing to the action of certain members of the Conference, to which reference was made at the business meeting, and to which Mr. Wood again refers in his letter in our present issue.

The full list of the old Committee is printed on p. 261 of our last week's issue.

The new Committee has the right to co-opt six additional members, and thirty other members are appointed independently by as many societies (enumerated in Rule 7). Of these, we understand that the following are already appointed on the new Committee:—

The Revs. J. H. Bibby, J. M. Connell, B. C. Constable, A. H. Dolphin, P. M. Higginson, F. H. Jones, W. H. Lambelle, H. D. Roberts, W. G. Tarrant, J. M. Lloyd Thomas, T. Arthur Thomas, C. Travers, G. H. Vance, Miss E. R. Leet, Messrs. Wm. Carter, W. Byng Kenrick, Ion Pritchard, T. Fletcher Robinson, and G. W. Rayner Wood.

#### "NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS."

SIR,—It is much to be regretted that the splendid success of the Bolton meetings was marred by an electioneering manoeuvre and a party triumph. Yet I should not trouble you with any comments on the matter but for the assertion which I find is being freely circulated that I and my friends did the same thing three years ago at Oxford. That statement is absolutely and entirely false. I have never before known of a list of candidates or nominations put forth by any party, still less of a list so headed—"National Conference Committee Nominations"—as to lead people to suppose that it emanated from official sources and with the sanction of the Committee of the Conference. My friends at Oxford made no agreement as to the persons they should vote for; the question was not then discussed, and, so far as is known to me, the election was perfectly spontaneous and free from party bias. Now, Sir, after agreeing, in the interests of peace, to compromise on my original resolution, I imagined, in the innocence of my mind, that party spirit would disappear at the Bolton meetings. It is true I had heard rumours weeks beforehand that an active canvass was going on with the hope of turning out the men who had supported, from time to time, my view of the functions of the Conference, but I declined to believe such a course was intended after what was a virtual compact of peace. So strongly was this impressed on my mind that I voted with pleasure for some of the names on the list of those who were conspiring to expel my friends, and I know that several with whom I have been most intimately associated did the same. Of course we should not have done this if we had known what was going on. Under the circumstances, I cannot but feel that the compact of peace has been betrayed, and that the promoters of the list have not been loyal to the spirit of conciliation which accepted the compromise. As for my resolution, I would far rather it had been rejected in open conference than reserved for smothering and strangling in committee.

JOSEPH WOOD.

Birmingham, April 27, 1909.



## CONFERENCE DISCUSSIONS.

## I.

## THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

THE address on "The Problem of Evil," by Professor Henry Jones, of Glasgow University, and Hibbert Lecturer in Metaphysics at Manchester College, Oxford, was given on Wednesday morning, April 21, the Rev. Dr. Carpenter in the chair. The address, as written, appears in our present issue, but without these vivid digressions and extempore amplifications of the argument which added so much to the charm and the intense interest of the occasion, but which cannot be reported. The result was that the address occupied practically the whole of the allotted time, and there could be no discussion. But everyone was well content, and the two speakers who were to have opened the discussion simply moved and seconded a vote of thanks as here recorded.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said that when the question arose as to the subject Professor Jones should be asked to take for his address, he had ventured to suggest that of the "Problem of Evil,"<sup>2</sup> because he knew how that problem weighed on the mind of the present generation, and how gravely it affected the religious thought of many of their own people, and still more of a large number of thoughtful persons, who would join with them heart and soul if once the great terror of an unjust God were lifted off their minds. Probably to no living man could that subject be offered with such hope of fruitful suggestion, of intellectual guidance and of moral inspiration. Professor Jones had sat at the feet of the great. He belonged, by distinguished genius, to the band of thinkers who were most looked to for guidance in the religious thought of our time. He had the greatest satisfaction in asking him to give his paper.

At the close Mr. W. R. BOYCE GIBSON, Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of London, author of "Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy of Life," "God with us, A study in Religious Idealism" &c., who was to have opened the discussion, moved a vote of thanks to Professor Jones, and spoke of his address as a grand and stirring utterance. It was a great theme greatly treated, shedding light on the darkest of all problems. They had felt the fire behind it, fire that had given them light and moral inspiration. Only on one point he felt obliged to demur. In some sense evil was real, and evil must be overcome, but he was not so certain that in any sense evil was essential to good. The possibility of evil was essential, but not the thing. Sin was not essential to moral perfection. The one categorical imperative of human nature was sinlessness. Temptation did not imply the necessity of evil. The impulse to guilt was not itself evil, only the possibility of evil. Only in yielding to temptation was evil brought about. Some of them felt it to be essential to insist on the fact that in no sense was evil a necessary thing.

The Rev. Dr. MELLONE, seconding the vote of thanks, spoke of the delight and perfect agreement with which he listened to Professor Jones's eloquent and moving address. It had been a direct appeal to

experience. Professor Jones had set them thinking, but thinking about real life. They realised that whatever might be in the end of things, now the struggle against evil was necessary for the realisation of good. That was the vital point in the address.

Professor JONES, in acknowledging the vote of thanks, said he thought he had made it plain that evil could never be the cause of good. It was certainly true, what Mr. Gibson had said, that the doing of moral evil was not a necessary step or stage of the good, but that did not touch the fact of relativity in the sense in which he spoke of it.

We may add here that we hope very shortly to publish an article by Mr. Boyce Gibson on the subject of Professor Jones's address.

## II.

## THE WIDER MEANING OF MODERNISM.

The two papers on "The Wider Meaning of Modernism," by the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas and J. Worsley Austin, also appear this week. They were given on Thursday morning, April 22, Mr. H. Woolcott Thompson, of Cardiff, being in the chair.

The Rev. W. G. TARRANT, who opened the discussion, said they were deeply indebted to the two readers for their papers. It would be difficult for anyone to recall a meeting of the Conference at which any single session had had papers exceeding in significance those two. They were in touch with something which at once required deep thinking and practical application. He was glad that Mr. Austin had to go on (in spite of the difficulty of following immediately upon the eloquent passion of Mr. Thomas's paper), that they might see how wide that problem was, and perhaps have time to consider a little more how it bore upon their own experience and expectations. Whatever might have happened since Huxley, and since the vast orb of Chesterton arose, the race of prophets had not quite died out. Mr. Thomas had brought to them a truly prophetic fire. He felt deeply, thought acutely, and wished them not to spare themselves the full force of his argument. The *Wider Meaning of Modernism* was their subject. The Modernist spirit existed before Tyrrell and the new Catholics, and manifested itself not only in Christendom but outside as well. The Christian tradition was dear to them, it touched their heart, and fructified their life, yet it was not the only form of religious revelation, and the Modernist spirit must not be cramped and confined by its tender associations. From Tyrrell they turned to Tolstoy, who surely was also a Modernist; and then they remembered also the prophets of India and Islam. The wider meaning of Modernism pointed to something far more than even the problem of the new Catholicism. He felt profoundly with Mr. Austin, when he said that the Modernists were a small group when compared with the great numbers of the Catholic Church. He had little hope of a church founded on the principle of authority, and he thanked Mr. Thomas for reminding them of Huxley. Did they

forget science? Who would say what was the authority to teach? When religious people began to speak of authority he thought of that baleful spirit of domination on the part of the learned, who told the plain man what he must do to be saved. That was what the Modernists were fighting against. Their hearts echoed to the core with Mr. Thomas's appeal for a social Modernism, concerned with the life and the homes of the people. In this land, and in other lands, even beyond the borders of Christendom, there was a new spirit. Modernism was as wide as the world, wherever the breath of a new revelation was granted to men, there had been that new stirring of hearts, and searching of minds for something more like what they felt to be the rightful inheritance of humanity. They were right to seek above all to be freed from limitations, either of theological definitions or social sympathies.

The Rev. W. I. SCHROEDER said that both heart and mind had been captured by the two papers to which they had listened, they were so much in agreement with the spirit of Mr. Thomas, and must accept Mr. Austin's definition of Modernism; and he went on to ask how far they as Unitarians were Modernists in temper and practice. They were obliged to confess that among their people there was much the same kind of ignorance and bigotry as among others. They might think they were among the enlightened, but so far as they accepted tradition, even Unitarian tradition, and flattered themselves that they were among the saved, so far were they removed from the true Modernist spirit. There was a great work still to be done, by ministers it might be, certainly by those who had any authority of personality, knowledge and experience in their church. Religion was often spoken of as if it were a definitely formulated expression of something, whereas surely it was the something itself, which could not be expressed so definitely that they could proclaim it in the shape of doctrine. So far as Modernism meant the attempt to realise religion itself, so far must they follow its lead. Were they not too much content with the affirmation of their glorious liberty, to the neglect of the thing crying out for solution. They took refuge behind the theologies of the past, but their task was to make known to men and women that God is in the heart of the social movement. They were an ineffective church because they had not realised what the church of God is. He pleaded for the recognition, if not the achievement, of the ideal so beautifully set out by Mr. Thomas, of a truly Catholic Church, not bounded by Christendom, the ideal of a church known in its completeness and perfection to God alone, the church which they could only dimly recognise in moments of insight and communion. They were faithless and unbelieving because they could not formulate those things, and dared to doubt that they existed. The church of God could not be confined; the spirit of God could not be limited. They might think they could formulate the operations of the Spirit, but "it bloweth where it listeth, we cannot tell whence and whither." In the faith of those who believe that God's Church means God Himself at the heart



of human life, who know the communion of soul which makes for righteousness, he prayed that they might be so inspired that they would cease to concern themselves with the errors of the denominations, and learn to correlate experience and ideals, and make men realise that in the church of God, independent of history, the Spirit of God must move, must breathe, must make itself known.

The Rev. E. W. LUMMIS asked their forgiveness if he was not fluent with an instrument he had hardly touched for four years. There was a certain advantage gained, he said, in moving about in quite different surroundings, human and otherwise, listening to quite different sounds from those to which they were accustomed. That morning had given them what they wanted. He had had those experiences on the border land of the Protestants and Catholics of Europe, in converse with both, and with the eternal mountains and the wonderful woods—beside death beds and with little children in the schools, talking a different language to ours—and that meant so much—and all the while, moving there in a strange environment, he had in his heart, England, Unitarianism, the Conference, and their common effort for the Kingdom of God. So the search had been automatic for something that would vivify their effort there in the United Kingdom. He had discovered that they did not need new ability, there was ability enough and to spare; and they did not need new thoughts. They wanted prophets, they said. Real religion was what they needed, and that was what the prophet brought; not new thought, but new emotion, and because they had been enjoying new emotion together that morning, they had felt a new breath of life, and a new power for good. Emotions were the dialects of thought. If they felt with their fellowmen, then for the first time they could understand what they were thinking. And till then they could not help them with their thoughts. He then went on to express the hope that such experience would lift them above their stupid little squabbles. He was a Unitarian; he was a Free Catholic; he was a B. & F. man, and a Conference man; there was absolutely no contradiction between those loyalties. He made most earnest appeal to the members of those committees to work together in that spirit, to be sure right through that what they were all aiming at was really the same thing, if only they would lay aside their suspicion of one another. And that he said also, in the name of the Roman Catholic, of the organised Protestant Church, of the Free Churches of this country, and in the name of the great multitude which considered itself outside all churches. Put aside suspicions and antipathies, and learn from the prophet to listen with a finer ear to finer harmonies of God, feel with a finer sense for new fragrances of God; that must be not through the thinking thought, but through the feeling heart, through sympathy with those deeper things. Men had been seeing and hearing in that old church; there were men essentially trying to do what they were trying to do. The emotions of those men were other than theirs; they worked under the stress of them, and, lo, they led them God-ward.

"Let us listen with them," Mr. Lummis concluded, "experience what they experience, open wide our hearts and not merely our minds, and through this force of sympathy be able to give to the world in sublimer measure and abundantly that which God has entrusted us to give."

Miss TAGART asked to be allowed to make a small contribution to the extremely touching and interesting papers they had heard. She had watched the Modernist movement both in Italy and France with the deepest interest, and she thought they could find its source in the struggle for Italian unity. It did not awake in the church itself, it was called out by the struggle inspired by Mazzini and Garibaldi, and that struggle permeated into the Church.

The CHAIRMAN, in conclusion, expressed the warm thanks of the Conference to Mr. Lloyd Thomas and Mr. Austin for their papers.

### III.

#### REFORM OF THE POOR LAW.

The Rev. P. H. WICKSTEED took the chair, in the absence of Sir John Brunner, on Thursday afternoon, April 22, when the subject of the Reform of the Poor Law was considered. The first paper, by Mrs. Bosanquet, was read by her brother, Mr. John Dendy. The second was by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Primrose-hill, a well-known member of the Christian Social Union. The two papers appeared in last week's INQUIRER. The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, expressed their great regret that Mrs. Bosanquet was prevented by ill-health from being present, and congratulated her on the honorary degree of LL.D. conferred upon her by the University of St. Andrews. He also mentioned that in Mr. Dearmer they had one who, he had reason to know, was regarded by Mrs. Sydney Webb as the very best person to speak to them on that subject from the point of view of the Minority Report.

Mrs. WILLIAM HASLAM, of Bolton, who opened the discussion, expressed personal regret that Mrs. Bosanquet was not present. It would have been an honour to Bolton, as well as to the Conference, to have had her, as one of the distinguished company of the Royal Commission, with them. They had had two most excellent papers. In the main the two Reports were similar and sympathetic; it was only in method that they differed. They had been expected with great impatience, for there was on every hand a large body of inertia to be overcome, and for the last three years those who wanted change had been asked to wait for the Commissions' Report. Now that it was out, the word would still be wait, on the ground that the Guardians were to be abolished. To any of them who were troubled about those questions, the Report had come with a flood of daylight. They saw much more clearly now. Abolition of the Boards of Guardians was in both reports. She could not quite agree with the severe criticism of the Boards of Guardians. Since 1894 considerable improvements had been introduced; there had been more classification, a broader dealing with the children, who were now boarded out and

sent to the regular schools; then, as to the nursing of the poor: formerly in Bolton they had two nurses and no resident doctor; now they had two resident doctors and thirty nurses; that was but an instance of the great improvement throughout the country. Some blame certainly attached to the Local Government Board, which, with all its power, was very slow to advise. It issued orders, but often only permissive. It ought to be more strenuous. More uniformity of treatment was essential, and district conferences of Guardians, such as that held in London, would be a great help. As to the proposed new authority, she did not think the suggestion of either report was workable. It was good to have a municipal unity, but she urged that between Town Councillors and the Guardians there was nothing to choose in point of education, social position, or enlightenment. It was a pity to go back from anything they had gained; they had to trust the voice of the people, and should leave some room for direct representation. It would be better if the County Council should elect a third of the authority from its own members, and let one-third be co-opted, and the other third be directly elected. Then they would get some women on the bodies. At present no Council would elect a woman, if it could help it. On the Public Assistance Committee women should be of the same standing as men. As to the suggestion of the Minority Report, in her judgment the various committees did not do their work so well that they would like to put anything else upon them. Certainly there was much more to be done in the way of classification. Out of the Commission much light had come, and she trusted that action would follow in due course.

The Rev. F. H. JONES said that Mrs. Haslam had spoken from her experience as a Guardian; he spoke as a minister of religion, who had been for some years in touch with Guardians' work in St. Pancras. The subject they were considering was the biggest thing they had got before them, a question that affected the whole future of their country down at the foundations, and they could not get rid of it by any process of crushing out or setting it aside. It was no more a question of doing something *for* the poor, but of doing something *with* them, and making them better than ourselves. He went on to speak of the value of the home influence on neglected children, to show how true it was that even "a poor home is better than a good institution," and how the boarding-out system brought the children into wholesome touch with the people. He was much moved by the applause with which Mr. Dearmer's paper was greeted at the end, and he asked them every one: Did that applause mean anything? Are you going to *do* anything? Are you going to wait for the outcome of this Commission, and for Acts of Parliament, or are you, as members of Christian churches, going to do something now, in personal service, without which the best system is of no use? Nothing but the personal touch would do, and he related a beautiful instance of what had been done by a young girl through personal kindness and patient sympathy to help and lift to



a higher level a poor woman and her children. It was impossible for the Guardians to be in personal touch with thousands of the people, but there was no other way, and he appealed to them, as members of Christian churches, to do their share. They should remember the saying that in this world all things are done by the people who do them, and it was not a bit of good saying that they had got the wrong people to do them, or they were doing them in the wrong way, unless they saw that they got the right ones. For anyone with a vote, the primary duty was to exercise it in the right and proper way whenever they had the opportunity. The present Poor Law was going. They were to have something different, and what they had would depend on how far they gave really intelligent and careful study to the question, and brought their influence to bear in regard to it. How it would work would depend on how they supported it by private and personal helpfulness to all they could in any way help and strengthen, to lift them to a life as good as, aye, and better, than their own.

Mr. S. S. MILLIN, of Dublin, said that the problem affected Ireland as well as England. He hoped that the Guardians would soon be driven out, for he agreed with both reports that the present system was undermining the foundations of society, and robbing manhood of its very fibre. But as regards the means of change, the plan of the majority seemed to him merely knocking Humpty Dumpty down to set him up again, and he was entirely for the Minority Report. They must have the Poor Law system broken up and eradicated, and make some attempt to overcome the evils of the present system. He did not agree with Mrs. Bosanquet when she said that the Majority scheme secured the maximum of reform with the minimum of disturbance. They must not sacrifice efficiency to simplicity. As regards the stigma on pauper children, it certainly remained in Ireland at least, in Belfast no National school would take a "pauper child." As regards the condition of poverty, there were in Dublin 26,000 families living in one room apiece. They owed a deep debt of gratitude to Mrs. Bosanquet, and as regards the duty of the churches to help in the work of reform, he reminded them that "the chivalry of modern life is the performance of public duty."

Miss HARRIET JOHNSON, of Liverpool, objected to the way in which the Majority Report dealt with the children. There should not be such a thing as a "pauper child"—men and women, if it must be, but not children! She referred to a book by Dr. Albert Wilson on "Education, Personality, and Crime," and especially the chapter on "Empire-building," as showing in a striking manner how lack of proper nourishment led to physical and moral deterioration. The Majority Report objected to the feeding of children, but in view of their criminal statistics she held that they could not do better than see that the children were properly fed. Both reports emphasised over and over again that drink was the largest cause of pauperism, but came very short in their suggestions of remedy. Nine-tenths of this pauperism was due to drink, but the

Commissioners merely recommended that the worst cases of inebriety should be looked up!

The Rev. R. P. FARLEY took the opportunity of announcing the programme of the Social Service Union, and urging its importance on the members of our churches.

Mr. JOHN DENDY said that he had listened with profound interest to Mr. Dearmer's paper. It was well that there should be men of such capacity, with so much fire of eloquence and enthusiasm, for that was a great part of the living force that was to lift them to higher levels. But there was another element needed. The element of slow and patient study, investigation of fact, long and laborious devotion to duties wearisome in the extreme. That element was largely represented in the Majority Report. They must weld the two together. Mr. Dearmer had seemed to suggest that there was a considerable class of comfortable, well-to-do people more or less indifferent to that question, and anxious to keep the poor in their present condition, willing to cold-shoulder the whole thing if they got the opportunity—and the danger was that they were backing the Majority Report. For his own part, he did not believe in the existence of such people. It was difficult for him to speak for his sister, but he knew that she would agree with him in saying that there could be no greater misfortune to that great question, than that either the one report or the other should be taken up as the peculiar possession of any political party, whether Liberal, Conservative, Labour or Socialist. It was for men and women of good-will, of whatever party, to pass beyond the divisions of political life, and unite in a determined effort to lift the condition of the people to a higher social and moral level.

The CHAIRMAN, in closing the meeting, said that any real progress must be based on patient study. The trouble was that those who felt were too impatient to think, but they must wed together thought and feeling. One of the special tasks of their Union for social service was to put all those who wished it into the best way of making an earnest and impartial study of the two reports, and the questions to which they referred.

#### IV.

#### OUR CONGREGATIONS: THEIR WORSHIP: THEIR MEMBERSHIP AND INTERNAL ORGANISATION.

The two papers of Friday morning, April 23, on "Our Congregations," "Their Worship," by the Rev. F. K. Freeston, and "Their Membership and Internal Organisation," by the Rev. James Harwood, appeared in last week's INQUIRER. Mr. Arthur Crook, of Bolton, a grandson of that notable Unitarian minister, the Rev. George Harris, presided in the absence of Sir William Bowring.

Mr. HENRY P. GREG, who opened the discussion, said that he believed strongly that church membership should be based on no financial qualification, but on an affirmation that the applicant for membership approved of the principles of the Church Trust; and he was strongly opposed to the rule of that church which enabled the Committee, on the nomination of the minister, to put on the roll of mem-

bership those who could not subscribe. Before God and the Church let them banish as far as possible the distinction between rich and poor. The support of the ministry and other necessary expenses must and ought to be met by voluntary subscription. The difficulty was that people subscribed not according to their ability, but their inclination, and they must find some method by which inclination could be brought into accord with ability. The real subject to discuss was, how to account for the fact that their membership was often not numerous and their worship not responsive. The Church seemed to divide mankind in two, sinners and saints; but the average man was neither sinner nor saint, and he wanted to plead for the average man. As such, he classed himself, and was conceited enough to fancy that they formed the majority of mankind. It was true Mr. Campbell told them the other day that in every sinner there was a potential saint, but might he not have gone on to say that in every saint there was a potential sinner? The Church talked about the unsaved and the saved, but to the average man that was something unreal, it was not practical politics. The average man was just beginning to be interested in salvation, but with an interest which hardly as yet prompted him even to ask the way. He was much struck once at a village lantern lecture on Rome, at the languid interest maintained in the description of the Forum, the size of the Coliseum, the luxury of Constantine's baths, but how that interest was kindled into ardent attention when in the subsequent discussion some one described how to get there. He told them what station he booked from, what time he took, what class he travelled, what was the cost, the difficulties of the journey, and how he surmounted them. Then the audience, mostly average men, viewed the whole lecture in a fresh light. Rome was no longer a castle in the air, a dream, an unreality, but a place accessible, not, perhaps, to-day or to-morrow, but some day, a place worth striving to reach and possible to reach. That parable he might carry a little further. All roads led to Rome, whether through the fertile plains of Tuscany or the arid deserts of North Africa. All roads led to Rome, whether through the fertile plains of self-sacrifice in the slums or the arid deserts of self-indulgence in Park-lane. Some were short and direct, others long and roundabout; but all led to Rome. The supreme need of the hour was to show the average man intelligently how he might reach Rome, the time it took by various routes, the advantages of the fast or slow trains, the cost of the varying methods of transportation, according to the requirements of each individual. There could be no personally conducted tours, and, therefore, it was all the more necessary that the information should be as full and in as much detail as possible. How could that be done? The Church must preach, not perhaps less to the saint above and the sinner below, but much more to the average man on the floor; it must consider the individual more, his peculiarities and idiosyncrasies. Years ago he asked a quiet country clergyman how it was his



sermons were so effective, and he replied: "In writing my sermons I always have in mind one member of my congregation, and in preaching it I am always surprised how many I seem to touch." That method he commended to their ministers. They wanted much more direct attention to the individual. So much the pulpit could do for the average man. And that Conference might help greatly if it would instruct the Committee to take up the subject of devotional literature. It could not do a finer thing for the churches than to issue a National Conference Prayer Book; not a book, the use of which would be compulsory, but which would be open to all, and would give common expression to the great needs of their life.

Mr. W. BYNG KENRICK said that, in regard to lay utterance, Mr. Freeston had not realised that the whole history and training of the congregations had led them to look for speech as a result of hard thinking; and for this laymen had not the leisure, so that their utterances were listened to with the very greatest reluctance. As to those who absented themselves from public worship lest they should be doing some violence to their reason, it was true that there were occasionally such reasons, with which they could find no fault, but those persons should recollect that they were placing themselves on a very high plain—a little higher than the angels! It was a tremendous challenge such a man made to his own soul. But for many of them, it was their duty to remind their friends that, where there was that question, whether they would do more harm in that way than good to their hearts by uniting with others in setting forth the ideal they all had, but very rarely attained, they should give the benefit of the doubt to public worship. He quite agreed that religion was mainly an affair of the heart, and that their churches were built and congregations established, to supply the need of that cry of the heart for public worship. If they had not the heartfelt need, it was no good building churches. But when they had a little of it, it was important what steps they took. As to the form of service, congregations differed in their constituents. Not all liked a liturgy; but it was always well for the sake of the service to consult in a friendly spirit with the organist. As to the veto on membership, he held it to be in theory undesirable and in experience unnecessary. He agreed with the spirit of Mr. Greg's utterance as to finance; they applauded, but did not act up to it. He pleaded for a public list of subscribers.

Mr. C. SYDNEY JONES welcomed the note of optimism which had characterised those meetings; they heard so much outside of things that depressed them in political, social, and religious life, and they did not attend enough to points of direct encouragement. Never in the history of Christianity had more men and women been found desirous of living up to the Christian ideal and bringing that spirit into their lives. Those people, anxious to act up to the great principles enunciated by Jesus, were found largely outside the churches, and he was not altogether alarmed at that. But if it was so, there was one pressing need, to supply a constant

stream of the men and women needed for the work; and surely there was no better means to supply that spirit than that the churches should develop the sense of the spirit of worship. There was so much lack of reverence in every form of life, political, social, and religious, and it was the duty of their churches to supply the lacking spirit, the true worshipful spirit. The future Church was not that which was political, critical, or propagandist. That they could get outside. They wanted the true sense of communion with God, and no group of churches could supply that need better than theirs. They had no need to pour new wine into old bottles, but they need not forget that though their bottles were new, the shape of the old was a very wise choice; in music, in art, in beauty and symbol, they could find many useful assistants to the provision of that spirit. Many were drawn into the higher life by that method. One great lesson of that Conference was that although they differed in matters of detail, they were all brothers working in one great cause. Beyond all ceremonies, forms, and organisations was the one constant undying need, the demand for personal devotion and self-sacrifice from every member of every congregation. If they could go home in that spirit the future of their Church was assured, and future conferences would be able to record constant steps of progress towards the ultimate goal of God's Kingdom upon earth.

Miss CLEPHAN said that as to the money basis, it was for them really to start the truest democracy in any congregation. They should make every member feel that if they could give only a penny, it was worth as much as the rich man's gift. They should make every one welcome, whether they could pay or not; but it was wise that even the poorest should put in his penny; and they should apply the parable of the labourers to that case, only it should read: The man who gives his penny is equal to the man who gives his twenty pounds or a thousand. And one more bit of democracy: she did not like to hear from that platform of the arid desert of Park-lane. The only time she had entered a house there it had been thrown freely open for the cause of the feeble-minded. There was a promise in the Old Book that some day the desert should blossom as the rose, and there was a good deal more blossom in that desert now than there used to be.

Mr. JOHN HARRISON, referring to the subject of ministers on the Committee, said that, as treasurer of a church, he was always delighted to see the minister attending. They ought to have a place on the Committee; but one common objection was the financial. Many committees must be ashamed to meet their ministers face to face when finance is discussed; but he hoped those difficulties would be overcome.

The Rev. J. B. HIGHAM pleaded for more simple and unconventional preaching, and natural fellowship between the minister and his people.

The resolution of thanks to Bolton friends, and the final address by Dr. Odgers on "The Ministry as a Vocation,"<sup>22</sup> included in this number, brought the proceedings of the Conference to a close.

## THE MINISTRY AS A VOCATION.

BY THE REV. DR. J. E. ODGERS.

THE subject which has been allotted to me is "The Ministry as a Vocation."<sup>22</sup> By this text I understand that I do not deal with any theory or ideal of the ministry, nor, on the other hand, do I discuss such questions as "How to be a Minister" or "How best to do a Minister's work." You would not expect a paper headed "Medicine as a Profession" to be a compendious treatise on therapeutics. I assume that my business is to try and tell you how this calling, the liberal ministry of religion, looks to me after more than forty years of it; and what it can promise to the young people of this generation who may be willing to consider it as a calling in life, among alternatives that may be open to them. Let me begin with the latter of these topics.

I am not going to apologise for urging the young people of our churches to seriously consider the ministry as a vocation for them, on the ground that it is not a lucrative profession. They know—there never was a generation that felt more deeply—that this is not the main thing. I think there never was a time when young people responded as they do now to the solemn call not to live to and for themselves alone. I know something of the young men who go from Oxford to live in settlements and missions in London—of the girls who go from our homes into the homes of poverty and squalor, taking upon themselves the cares of friendly sympathy and helpfulness. And there are other signs of the times to which little attention has been drawn. The church is recruiting a large number of young and energetic workers, in whom the social interest is dominant—the theological interest hardly existing. They are living hard and strenuous lives among the poor, running guilds, clubs, armies, institutes, concerts, while not neglecting the most definite and authoritative personal direction; all making the church the one thing the man in the district cannot help knocking up against the moment he leaves his own door. I believe that the young men who, on leaving the University, thus take the church as their patroness and devote to her the energies of their social service, do this from a rooted conviction that in the social (or socialistic) changes which they anticipate the question will at once arise—Is the new regime to be with Religion or without it? Are we going to have an industrial paradise with no God? A reign of liberty and equality with no moral law? And it seems to them that in such a crisis the church will be the only power on the side of religion that cannot be ignored. Whether she speaks with authority or pleading, her testimony, built up on the unrelenting work and devotion of her sons, cannot be set aside.

It may be so. I will not indulge in prediction. I only note the stimulus to the new sort of ecclesiasticism which has been imparted by the great movement of social interest and responsibility of which we are all conscious. It is perhaps no business of ours to calculate the chances whether liberal religion will be effective to spirit-



ualise the facts and relations of life in some social state as yet unrealised. Meanwhile, we have to stand in our lot, to speak our own word as God gives it to us, to deal with men and women as living souls. We have the solemn responsibility of the direct service of God and man, and we cannot make this secondary to the promotion of an institution or an organisation or a party. I am desirous above all things that the whole *religious* value of our liberal tradition should be conserved, not to be blown aside by the transient fervours of this year or the next, not to be subordinated to even the worthiest of secular interests. The ministry must be the first interest to the man who intends to be a minister. I can predict neither happiness nor success for the man who proposes to use his ministry merely as a jumping-off place for activity in something else in which he is more interested. It is the man who is doing his own business, and doing it effectively, who is welcomed when he steps into more public effort, be it only the sanitary or educational improvement of a small town. One might be tempted to suppose, now that so many things in which our ministers of a former generation were initiators and leaders, are in charge of public bodies and councils—(think of education, ragged schools, night schools, reformatories, mechanics' institutes—I think especially of my father's work as a pioneer of sanitary reform)—that there is no more left, if it be not the official work of a councillor or a guardian, for individual effort. But that is not so; there are still countless things that must go through the stage of personal interest and experiment before they can claim public attention and support. There is still for the man of keen sympathy and social interest a sphere of useful work, but the minister who neglects his own business is apt to find that he is not in it. The minister who, after summoning a committee, keeps men just on their way to or from business, waiting for him; arrives without the minute-book, or if he has, in hot haste, fetched it, finds that he has not written up the minutes of the last meeting and has left the correspondence behind him—this man is annoyed to discover that when, out of politeness, it is proposed to place him on a public committee or ask him to be secretary, whether for University extension or for a feeble-minded school, his own people have only looked blank and shaken their heads, and is apt to complain aloud.

Now, I think that this is partly due to a mistaken idea as to what fitness for the ministry really is. There is a notion that a minister is born, not made, due perhaps to an impulse caught from American Transcendentalism, a notion that the minister should be regarded as a kind of irresponsible genius not to be judged by ordinary standards, a tendency to stake everything on the originality of his pulpit utterances. We see a strong reaction against this, I think, in the somewhat over-planned institutionalism of our churches to-day. But the *nascitur non fit* theory persists and finds many mistaken applications. I wish to speak with all kindness, but I have had occasion within my experience to notice not infrequently

one of these. One boy in a family is distinguished by an absence of alertness, which is taken for seriousness; by a tendency not to study, but to brood; or by a desire to write verses and contribute to the local journal. He is supposed to be marked out for the ministry. We are apt to be rather hard in our view of the family living as a refuge for the lad who is not smart enough for anything else; but we are, in fact, prone to take much the same line. There are those, I am thankful to say, who will fight their way into the ministry, college or no college, and justify their claim at every step. But there are those who, with little more knowledge of the ministry than the family belief that it is what they are fit for, find the requirements of study and training to be mere burden and disillusionment, and, in the end, have lost what little confidence they ever had. I would welcome as a student for the ministry the religiously-minded lad who, without claiming any exceptional spiritual experience, has looked steadily at the ministry, and tried to realise what it involves; who has learned at a good school his own powers and limitations; who knows he can no more be a minister without due preparation than he can be a solicitor without serving his articles; who is willing to take risks, and confident, not so much in what he is, as in what he believes he can, with powers conscientiously developed and opportunities faithfully used, make of himself. The man I do not welcome is the one who has perfect confidence in himself as he is, and professes that all he wants is the stamp which a degree—or the introduction, as I have heard it called, which a college can give him.

I sincerely hope that the Academic Board in connection with this Conference may soon be in working order. It is obvious that the churches should provide for the succession of their own ministry, affording, through an organisation of their own, direction and guidance to the candidate and assisting him in the preparation that is judged best for his particular case, from an early stage. I have long had much sympathy for the young men who for lack of such guidance, fail to obtain entrance to a college. The college authorities say, with perfect justice, "You do not come up to our requirements; you are really unable to avail yourself of the education we can offer." But this ought not to be accepted as equivalent to "You can never be a minister."

While I am speaking of things we want, let me mention one or two more. I sometimes think we want a bishop, an overseer; in the United States, where they are accustomed to personal rule, they follow the analogy of the States and call him President. We are more independent than the Independents; there is not a body among us that has anything like the practical influence that is exercised by a County Congregational association. We need a more settled, serious, and well-understood practice with regard to ministerial settlements and removals. What disappointments, what connections that never had a morsel of promise in them, would be avoided, if it were the

business of a third party (of experience and judgment) to mediate, or as the phrase is in the case of a Presbytery, to "moderate in a call" of a minister by a congregation. I am concerned at least for the comfort and dignity of the ministry as a profession. I know that many a minister is induced to undertake the up-rooting and the, perhaps, expensive removal of himself and his family, by receiving what professes to be an unanimous invitation from a congregation—when the fact is that the congregation which invites him is split into factions, each in favour of some other man, but not strong enough to carry his election; and he, the invited man, is merely a neutral person who is nobody's first choice, suggested by the chairman at the end of a confused meeting as a possible chance of restoring unity, or, at least, providing a temporary truce. If he accepts the invitation, he is often painfully made aware that nobody wanted him, and is regaled with numerous minority-reports as to the circumstances which led to his being invited. This sort of thing ought to be impossible, and I do not see how it is to be avoided except by a reformed procedure which should include the intervention of a person or a body charged with seeing that the invited man has all the circumstances before him. As for interference with the independence of congregations, I know how it would be accepted in some quarters and resisted in others; but I believe the better mind would prevail. It was a man bearing one of the most honoured names in our churches who said to me "I am quite sure that our congregation is not of itself competent to appoint your successor. Several men will propose themselves, and all we shall know of them will be that one preaches a little better than another; but that is not enough for our purpose, we ought to have help and guidance from a recognised quarter." You all know the other sort who say, as I have had said to myself, "We will dispose of our living as we please, and when we please, and we don't stand any interference." And this sort of man will sometimes add "We have advertised, and we have got thirty-seven applicants to hear, and we are saving money on it." This calls for no criticism. It is the seamy side of the voluntary system.

And we need some kind of intervention oftentimes in the matter of resignations. A minister is goaded into a state of morbid sensitiveness by a small persistent opposition or depreciation on the part of this man or that. He cannot for shame tell the tale of trivial annoyances; and good people, who divine that there is something wrong, only say "Don't take notice of anything Mr. So-and-so says." There are cruel cases where it is very hard for a struggling man to stand on his dignity; where all the liberty seems to be on the side of the congregation that lightly brings him and lightly lets him go. There are cases where adjustment might follow a frank exposition of the circumstances made to a judicious advisor; where for some reason the minister thinks he ought to go and the congregations does not, and *vice versa* (and this *vice versa* is the more difficult case)



And there is another matter in which I think an official person or body might do much to improve the status of the ministry as a profession. I have testified for years that we need some simple and natural way in which *promotion by merit* might be made a fact among us. It is nobody's business to see that the good and modest man has the chance of a rise. A friend may shyly put in a word for him here or there, but, because he has just been hoeing his own furrow and not looking over the hedge, the reply is merely "Never heard of him." Of course, we cannot have an authoritative system of selection and allocation like that of the Wesleyan, that is not what I mean. But you know that we have had in different parts of the country leading laymen to whose advice recourse was often had in cases of congregations wanting ministers. To such I have occasionally suggested the name of a man who, in my opinion, had earned promotion, to whom at all events a sign that his work was not unmarked would be welcome. The answer uniformly was "Oh, he is doing very good work where he is, and it is a pity to disturb him; now Mr. X. is known to be moveable"; so Mr. X. (of whom his mobility, which was chronic, was the only thing we did know) got the chance which, I maintain, the other man ought to have had. This stagnation of promotion has a very discouraging effect upon the younger ministers, who feel sometimes that they are left in a kind of backwater, and begin to think that if they want a few more pounds for their families or a bit more room for energies or abilities they may have developed, they must look to some pursuit outside the ministry. In the ministry, as in most professions, there is always plenty of room at the top. We want more ways to the top; more certainty that the concentration of good powers and vigorous effort upon the ministry itself will gain due recognition. We want the stimulus which comes to the young man in the church, the army, or the office, from the consciousness that it is somebody's business to keep an eye on promise, on performance, on ability ripened by responsibility; and that this means promotion. We have no such certainty and little of such stimulation. It has fallen to my lot to speak thus to a young man leaving college—"You have a choice before you; you can go, if you choose, to minister to a quiet country congregation, that wants just what it has had; what it requires is easily within your powers, and the salary is sufficient; or you can go to a struggling mission, where you will largely have to shape your own methods and efforts for yourself, where you have to work hard and live hard; but it will be the making of you, and all you do will be to your credit; and I pledge my word that, if you make this venture, I will see that you are not forgotten, and will do my utmost to secure you the chance of promotion after two or three years, if you then wish for change." But my assurance was not good enough. One naturally wishes one's pupils to have favourable starts in life; but with what a glow of fervent sympathy does one see one of them set aside the prospect of immediate comfort and competence, and accept the challenge to

endure hardness, and prove his powers on some outpost of duty.

I have spoken of an "Immediate prospect of comfort and competence" as open to a young man on leaving college. Very often it is so. I have a feeling that it is not quite right that the untried man should have—not merely as good, but sometimes—better chances than the man who has put in some years of work. But so it is; he has prospects of an income that will enable him to marry, if he be so disposed, sooner than the curate—and I suppose there is hardly a dignitary of the Church who did not start his clerical life on a curacy of £120 a year or less—sooner than his college contemporaries who take to law, medicine, or business. You may think I am far gone into ecclesiasticism when I say that if we have a Board connected with this Conference to act on behalf of the churches in the provision of a succession in the ministry, we might well have the same, or a similar body representative of the churches, dealing with the introduction to the ministry of the young men over whose preparation it has held a guiding hand. Such introduction ought not to be left to the chance preaching engagements of a last year at college, or to the kindly offices of the Principal.

There is another professional matter which I can only mention in passing, but which is a cause, as I have known, of some serious personal embarrassment. Our liberal ministry is, I think, the only ministry, and the only profession, which has no voice, through its own representative bodies, as to admission to its own membership. The congregation of Little Pedlington, having held a meeting and exercised its inalienable right, shoots a new brother minister into my arms, which are supposed to be wide open, at its bidding, to receive him, about once a year. To make even the simplest personal inquiries is held to be discourteous and churlish. Here again, we want at least a usage and an understanding which the occasional action of our Advisory Committees, which can only proceed upon definite appeal or request, has not yet brought about.

Do I seem to be wishing to stamp some kind of uniformity upon the *personnel* or upon the conditions of our ministry? Nothing can be further from my purpose. My motto for Church and for State is that of Alexander von Humboldt, "Freedom and variety of situations." I should be very sorry if this Conference were to be the means of impressing identity of view or method upon the congregations which compose it. The essentials of our ministry are Faith and Sympathy, and these can never be of one pattern. They are personal qualities, and cannot be adopted or simulated as qualifications. If your faith seems to isolate you, your sympathy restores you to a human companionship that is not limited by sect or creed. We have to find our own ways, and they often seem for a time to be lonely ones. A good clergyman once said to me, "You must be aware that in all things in which religious bodies are accustomed to co-operate to some degree, a very black line is drawn just above your name, and I often wonder how you like it." That black line never cut me off from friendly intercourse with

people of all churches, to whom perhaps I was known as one who respected other people's convictions rather than one who merely rejected them; and that line appears to me to mark a destiny which is more and more becoming ours if we will accept it. I have always had something of the nature of a pastorate of the unchurched, of a sympathetic relation based, in the case of many educated people, on a belief that I could have no reason for not saying what I thought; and in the case of the poor, on a belief that I was not likely to make any stipulations about attending my chapel. But I am sure that in either case, I was sought because it was believed that religion was my business and that friendly helpfulness was a characteristic of our people. Our first duty is to our congregations; but our traditions do not tie us up to the sole service of a particular church. The Presbyterian father called himself *Verbi Divini Minister*, servant of God's word, not of a congregation. Faith in the ever old, ever new, Word of God which we serve, is the first requisite. And the sympathy that must come to you if you take the opportunities that are sure to come of entering into the struggling lives of men and women around you, brings its exceeding great reward in the discovery of goodness, fortitude, hopefulness, the fragmentary testimonies of God's presence, where you least expect to find them.

Said a well-known Oxford man to me—"The Church with its festivals and lessons and collects provides the clergy with topics for preaching all the year round: but you—when you have done hammering away at your old humanitarianism, I wonder what you can find to talk about?" In the fact that we know sources of suggestion, ay, of inspiration beyond these—the tremendous interest of the world, of mankind, of all life, and the pressing need of such interpretation of these things as cannot be jammed into a church almanac—is there not a new charter for a free ministry that trusts in God and strives to speak His word for the time? And for us, who have never enforced finalities and limitations in the interpretation of that word, who have believed that there are many voices in the world and none of them without signification, there is no break between the new and the old. There is a continuity of progressive thought and knowledge unbroken by censures and exclusions. The men of my generation can hand on to our successors the traditions we received from our fathers in the Church without alarm or misgiving. May our successors be as rich as they, our fathers, were in the satisfactions of patient testimony of truth, of manifold usefulness, in seeing of the labour of their hands, it may be, after many years, and in—

"that best portion of a good man's life  
His little, nameless unremembered acts  
Of kindness and of love."

LET us cherish no illusions, let us make no vain pretence, let us speak the fullest truth and do the plainest duty that we know; and then we shall not widely fail of what is best for us in this or any world which shares the boundless fullness of the life of God.—J. W. Chadwick.



# THE CONFERENCE SERMON.

## THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL.\*

BY THE REV. PHILIP H. WICKSTEED, M.A.

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."—REVELATION xiv. 6.

At the close of the twelfth century when Innocent III. was on the Papal throne, a certain Abbot Joachim presided over a special order of Cistercians, of which he was the founder, in the monastery of Flora, now San Giovanni in Fiore, in the mountains of Calabria. In those days the interpretation of Scripture consisted not in what we should now regard as philosophical or scholarly penetration into the meaning of the text, but in the allegorising art which extracted spiritual or moral significance from every event and every word. Hence the credibility of the stories, which we frequently encounter, of uneducated persons of either sex who had a gift for interpreting Scripture which astounded the most learned doctors, and was attributed to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Tradition declares that Abbot Joachim was one of these apparently unlettered interpreters, who had achieved so great celebrity that an earlier pope had relieved him from some of the practical duties of the position he then held, in order that he might devote himself completely to the study and the exposition of the Scriptures. And now, in the year 1200, he reverently submitted his principal writings to the consideration of the Papal See, to receive its sanction, correction, or condemnation. Whether Innocent ever looked at them we do not know. At any rate, no official opinion was expressed upon them till long afterwards, and then on the occasion of quite another appeal. But the modern reader who glances at their contents will be sufficiently amazed at the boldness of their speculations and at the naivety of the Abbot's good faith in submitting them to Papal revision. For, while in the main they conform to the general character of the allegorising mysticism of the time they contain certain revolutionary speculations, the acceptance of which would be fatal to the whole theory of an organised and authoritative Church. For Abbot Joachim read in Old and New Testament alike the proclamation of the "Everlasting Gospel," which was to consume the earth of the Old Testament and the water of the New, even as the fire that descended from heaven consumed the earth of Elijah's altar, and the water with which it had been drenched. The first dispensation—that of the Father—was embodied in the letter of the Old Testament law; the second dispensation—that of the Son—in the letter of the Gospel of Christ; but the third dispensation—that of the Holy Spirit—was embodied in no letter at all, for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life. It proceeds from the Gospel of Christ, but transcends it, even as the Gospel of Christ transcended the Law of Moses: as the unveiled face of Christ transcends the unveiled face of Moses, so shall the glory of the third dispensation transcend that of the second. Even so the light of

the moon transcends the light of the stars, but is itself transcended by the light of the sun; for "that which was committed to us by Christ or the Apostles according to the faith of the sacraments, passeth away and is but for a time, as regards the sacraments themselves, but as regards that which is signified by them, is eternal." This gospel that shall reveal the hidden meaning of all that has gone before it, is the everlasting gospel committed to the Apocalyptic angel. It shall put an end to all schisms and divisions, and shall endure till the end of the world. It underlies both the conflicting creeds of Christendom. Indeed, the Greek Church which came out or "proceeded" from the Roman Church, has some special affinities of its own to the gospel of the Holy Spirit which "proceeds" from the Old and New Testaments, whereas the Latin Church has its special analogies with the gospel of the Son. For the Latin Church laments, and sings no songs of joy throughout the season of Lent, because "the Son of God bore the sorrow of the passion for the salvation of the world"; whereas the Greek Church sings Hallelujah throughout that whole season, because "the Holy Spirit plies with exultation those whom it breathes upon." And not only the Greeks shall respond to the quickening Spirit, when it is released from the deadening letter, but "the gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached to the whole world, and this spiritual understanding shall pierce even to the Jews, and like a thunderbolt shall shatter the hardness of their hearts. And it shall be fulfilled which is written in the Prophet Malachi:—"And behold he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." And the truth which came from the far East, through the Greeks, shall return thither, stripped of the veil that obscures it, and all shall enjoy the open vision.

The subsequent history of this doctrine of the Everlasting Gospel is instructive. Joachim having fixed the period at which the Everlasting Gospel was to fructify at about 1260, himself died in 1202; and about 50 years afterwards a certain Brother Gerard, a Franciscan, wrote an "Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel," which we only know from the sentence passed on it by a Papal commission, held at Anagni, soon after its first appearance. From this we learn that Gerard held the writings of Joachim not to proclaim only, but actually to constitute the Everlasting Gospel, Joachim himself being the Apocalyptic angel to whom it was committed. Francis of Assisi was another angel of the Apocalypse—that one who "bore the seal of the living God," and the Franciscans themselves were at any rate the provisional custodians of the Everlasting Gospel. The life had gone out of the Old and New Testaments about the year 1200, and in 1260 (according to the prediction of Joachim himself) the Gospel of Christ was to come to an end.

This lapse into the literal conception of the Gospel as a book, and reconfining of the channel through which it flowed to a single personality, is a striking exemplification of the irony of history. Joachim's preaching did but share the fate of the preaching of Jesus, for Jesus abolished the limitations of the covenant with Israel

and substituted for the artificial sanctity of traditions and ceremonies, the inherent sanctities of the relations and experiences of life, but the world has only accepted this universal gospel of man's direct and inalienable relation to God by making Jesus himself the sole channel of grace, erecting in his name a huge sacramental system, and handing over the whole world, as such, to perdition in the dictum—"outside the Church is no salvation."

Indeed Joachim himself had prepared the way for the sterilising of his own conception, for, as we have seen, he had assigned a definite date (1260, forty-two generations after the birth of Christ) for the fructification of the Everlasting Gospel, and, while declaring that the sacraments and the priesthood would be done away, and quoting the great text in Jeremiah that no man should teach his brother, saying "Know the Lord," because all should know him, from the greatest to the least, he had nevertheless announced that the order of monks would be the guardians and repositories of the Everlasting Gospel as the celebrate priests had been of the Gospel of Christ, and the married ones of the Law of Moses. And yet it is impossible not to trace in Joachim's speculations the kernel truth that the final test of revelation consists in its harmony with an inward sense and experience, which can never perfectly express itself in any outward utterance, can never formulate itself in any creed, can never embody itself in any sacrament, can never impose itself from without, but must always remain a thing of inward and direct perception. The breathings of the Holy Spirit flow through our inmost life, and are recognised by their own inherent authority. Hence the profundity of the conception that the divisions, whether between the Eastern and Western Churches, or between Christian, Jew and Gentile, are due to the channels through which the Spirit has flowed, and not to the breathings of the Spirit itself. Codes, creeds and sacraments are for a time. They obscure and impede that which they would express. They set men at enmity and strife, one with the other; but could the Everlasting Gospel, which underlies them all, and is one in them all, be liberated from its bondage in them, it would be recognised as the universal and the everlasting Gospel, that unites and divides not.

The form which Joachim's conception took was conditioned by the creed of the Christian Church, though hardly confined by it; but in its essence it was wholly independent of the doctrine of the Trinity to which it linked itself. It was essentially the same conception as that expressed by Jeremiah and the Deuteronomist—"the law written upon the heart," superseding not only all outward compulsion but all formal preaching and proclamation—the direct and personal inspiration which substitutes impulse for command. Few dare to dream of the time when all these visions shall be literally realised—when law, discipline, command, creeds, sacraments, and institutions shall vanish in the light of direct vision and in the fire of spiritual passion. But if it be true, as I once heard from the lips of a Hegelian philosopher, that it is vain to look for the truth of things to the end of some process;

\* The Sermon preached in Bolton Town Hall, on Tuesday evening, April 20.



because "It is not at the end of any thing. The truth of things is at the *bottom* of them," then we may say that it is from this direct vision and passion that all institutions, sacraments, creeds and laws must derive their ultimate sanction; and though it be only in the chosen few that they rise to all-consuming and all-assimilating intensity, yet it is on something akin to themselves in the rank and file of humanity that they live and grow. Here is the everlasting source from which they are renewed. They change, but it abides. They grow old, and oppress the life out of which they sprang; but the life itself is perennial. Beliefs and institutions may come and go as the result of a process. The sense and vision of Good are the "truth of things at the bottom of them," and are the Everlasting Gospel, ever attempting to clothe itself in form, or in creed, or in ordinance; ever finding that its expression has become its oppression; that the body which it informed is obscuring and materialising it; and so rebelling to-day against its preaching of yesterday; and yet ever essentially the same—an everlasting Gospel.

I think no man who knows himself or others will deny the support that the soul may find alike in creeds and sacraments, or the power that they may have to foster and interpret the promptings of the Spirit which without them it might scarcely recognise. But how can we deny that they also may and do confine and deaden? When there is discord between the inner life of the soul and the inherited formulas of the creed, when the sacraments, round which all the deepest and holiest experiences of the soul have been taught to rally, themselves become unmeaning or repellent, the struggling soul may find that in its growing season when it most needs support and sympathy it is cut off from the fellowship it craves, regarded as lost and dead, the very breathings of its life shrunk from as a pestilence, till it is perhaps itself persuaded that its throbs of life are the pangs of death.

Men feel this and fear it, and so we live in an age when creeds are on the defensive. Outward authority is failing them on every side, and they are seeking to justify themselves by an appeal to inner experience. They feel that if they are to live, they must show not that they were once inspired and have authentic credentials to prove it, but that here and now the testimony of the Holy Spirit, authentically borne in each man's bosom, not only sanctions but embraces them. They can no longer be openly received as an inheritance from the past; they must at least proclaim themselves as re-created and inspired by the present life of the soul and the intelligence; and even those who attach most value to tradition endeavour to justify their adhesion to it by a living instinct for fellowship and continuity, rather than by any externally binding authority. And unreal as many of their pleas may appear to us, they are at least a recognition of the supremacy of the Holy Spirit—an admission that all written and formulated gospels must live or die as the breath of the Everlasting Gospel, that never was or can be written, destroys or transfigures them.

Yet what is all this but mere common

form, idle declamation at its worst, and a "speaking with tongues" that may excite but can hardly edify at its worst? If it is to be more than this we must try to give ourselves some articulate account of what we really mean by the breathings of the Holy Spirit in our hearts to-day. But the attempt if necessary is also paradoxical; for it is the attempt to formulate that which defies and transcends all formulæ and to reduce to intellectual propositions the experiences of the soul.

I shall strive for no such formula, but returning to Joachim's speculations I will try to catch one echo, to touch one note, and recognise one accent of the Holy Ghost which we at least must not lose. It is the note which at its highest is the note of divine joy in life, and reduced to the terms of common place humanity and common place experience is just the sense that life itself is in its essence good. And I would speak of this under two aspects, first that of the growing social sense, and secondly that of mystic communion which the saints have called the fruition of the Divine Aspect, but of which every man who has felt himself at one with Nature knows some echo or far off reflection.

I have spoken of the growing social sense. I know that it often seems a feeble force in the presence of all the fierce and selfish passions and all the cold, relentless selfishness that sway mankind. But I hardly understand how any man can doubt that it is growing. Nay, the very terms under which the fundamental topics of ethics were discussed in my youth seem to lose their meaning in the presence of this growing social sense. For the discussion as to whether we care for others for their own sake or for ours—the question whether a man is benevolent because it gives him pleasure to relieve pain, or whether it gives him pleasure to relieve pain because he is benevolent—seems to rest on a sharp severance of my own personality from that of others, which is false to the facts of life.

The mere phrase that now occurs in books of psychology—"the *Conjunct Self*"—proclaims the change involved in the recognition of the social sense as a fundamental fact of experience. There is no man that does, or can, entirely separate himself from his kind as an object of solicitude. However completely I am the centre of my own regard, I cannot choose but care in some degree for others, if it were but that my own self is unrealisable, not only without their help but without their self-realisation also. This sense that the victories of life must be won not for *me* but for *us*, this deepening care for others, this sense that their well-being matters and matters to me, empties of its meaning the question whether it matters to me for my sake or for theirs, because I cannot isolate myself. To recognise this is to recognise the social sense. It has always been in the world. It is in the world now. It has inspired saints and apostles with a passion of missionary and self-sacrificing ardour, which was at the same time their highest self-realisation and self-fulfilment. In others it has been of narrower range and of less intensity, as the circumference of realised insight has drawn nearer to the centre of self. But only monsters or madmen can even

seem wholly to escape it. And the material on which it works is our experience of good and evil. Suffering and anguish breathe into our souls pity for others, and joy and beauty, the exultation of effort and achievement, inspire us with the sense of unrealised possibilities in the experiences of others, others apart from whom our life cannot reach its fulfilment, and the desire that the gates of a fuller and stronger life should be thrown open to them. The material on which the social sense works is the sense of life; and that strange persistent instinct, seeming to be constantly defied by experience and yet resting on a deeper experience yet—that instinct that, however exceptional the life that it is good to live may be, it is essential, normal and permanent; and, that however widespread and persistent the life that it is evil to live, it is in some strange way accidental, transient, unnatural and monstrous. The sense of harmony between man and his environment proclaims itself as existing of right in relation to the fundamental constitution of things; and it is discord that needs to be accounted for as something alien. It may be true that no system of theology or of philosophy has ever succeeded in accounting for it. The attempt is the task of the creeds, and though we should never accomplish the task, or find a creed that will account for evil, yet it is the direct dictate of our spiritual sense, the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, that it is evil and not good that needs to be explained. I have said that this sense of the goodness of life is contradicted by experience, and yet rests on a deeper experience yet. Are there not friends who scarce ever meet without quarrelling, and who yet not only know all the while, but feel, that the harmony which keeps their affection alive, though it seems to have nothing to feed on, is more real, essential and central, though it can never get itself expressed and embodied, than the obstinate and apparently invincible incoherencies and irrelevancies which seem to win perpetual outward victory over it and yet never storm the citadel? But sometimes this sense of the goodness of life wins its outward victories as well as defending its fortresses. It is like an artistic sense, and obedience to it constitutes the art of life. "My disciples," said Epicurus, "write no poems. They live them." Their sense of the essential goodness of life at once created and proclaimed that goodness, as the artist's eye sees beauty and his hand creates and proclaims it. Indeed this analogy of the artist may carry us far. The artist sees the obvious beauty that every eye can see, but he sees beauty too where the casual eye sees it not. He is perpetually extending the range of beauty, and, like the alchemist, transmutes the baser metals into gold. Ideally the artist, whatever may be his medium, expresses himself in obedience to his inward impulse, and with reference only to himself; but unless he is controlled by the social medium of expression, his utterances become incoherent and futile. He cannot fully express himself except socially and under restraint; otherwise he merely *spills* himself, and presently has no self even to spill. It is true that the great poet or artist in his highest



moments is not thinking of any reader or spectator. He is face to face with his vision, and is striving only to express it; but his work will not be great unless he holds others, so to speak, in solution in his own soul. The conscious reference to them to check and discipline his own expression, the conscious effort to make it intelligible to them, as well as satisfactory to himself, is the sign that he is not at his highest. But he can only finally trust his own inspiration when he has so assimilated others to himself by the social sense that what will be essentially obscure, incoherent or unintelligible, to others inherently capable of seeing what he sees and rightly prepared for it, shall be rejected by him as inadequate and unsatisfactory to himself.

So with the man who has tasted true life. He knows that he cannot realise it alone, that self-achievement and self-expression involve self discipline, because without it there is no coherent self at all. His anti-social and destructive impulses must be checked, for if not they will destroy the very element and medium in which self-realisation—the realisation of the Conjoint Self which is the only possible self to be realised—must take place. And he has not attained full self-realisation and self-expression until anti-social and corrosively selfish action or emotion is felt by him in his own personality as an evil and horrible thing.

The sense of duty is like the artist's discipline in learning so to command his medium that it shall express to others as well as to himself the thing that he has seen. It shows that the social sense has not entered into full possession of his will, and assimilated to itself his affections and emotions, and yet it derives its authority, asserted as from without, from the inward sanction of his own ideal. It is there to mould him in his immaturity, to support him in his weakness, but it is the expression of his own inmost self—the ideal self which, by its inherent right, is drawing to itself and bringing to self-realisation the mutually conflicting elements of his soul.

The sense of duty, then, Kant's categorical imperative "thou must" is but derivative from the sense of good, brought to consciousness in the social sense. "Thou must" is but the echo, that comes back in times of weakness, of the cry of exultation uttered by the soul in times of strength, "I will!"

But if the sense of good, as normal and existing of right, is material on which the social sense works, so likewise is the sense of misery and evil as actually existing. Sometimes the sense of pity works when the sense of joy is dead. But the mere impulse of pity is a negative thing. Those that have never found for themselves that life is good, or who have stunted and starved their own appetite for life, may be sorry for the sufferings of others, but they cannot quicken in them the sense of life. I have been told by one of large experience in philanthropic work that as a rule his helpers were of no use to anyone after three years work; because by that time they had nothing to give. He could not make them understand that to convey life to others they must themselves be alive, and that if they starved their own souls and their own sense of beauty and

life and joy in the attempt to minister to others, they were drying up the very fountains from which the living waters were to flow. Sense of evil and desire to relieve it is of the material on which the social sense works, but its inspiration must come from the sense of good.

This sense of good is rightly and necessarily for ever attempting to formulate itself in some kind of creed, a belief that shall make it secure against the rise and fall in its own intensity. In the very nature of the case, it is when our sense of good is dull or uncertain that we want some positive assurance of its reality. In so far as such a creed is a register of our own insight or the collective register of the insight of others, which we in our own moments of insight have accepted and sanctioned, it may bear us over seasons of depression and of dullness. But if it has never been filled out by experience it can never be more than a shell. When Coleridge, in his depression, gazed upon the stars and clouds, saw the light from the setting sun and the beauty of the moon and cried,—

"I see them all so excellently fair,  
I see, not feel, how beautiful they are,"

it was something indeed that he could still see it. It was the assurance that they were beautiful, and that their beauty was there for others to feel and for him to feel again when the time should come. But if he had never felt that they were beautiful in his hour of insight, he could not have even seen that they were beautiful in the hour of his depression. So he who has not tasted and seen that life is good can have no inward hold on any creed that declares it to be so. But he who has tasted and seen, and whose knowledge of the good of life has been transfigured by the social sense, may live on, even if his own life should be desolated by affliction and bereavement, in something more than stoic fidelity, in the active knowledge that life now holds for others what it has once held for him; and he may love and bless that which he can no longer taste.

Ideally, then, there is no conflict between law and gospel, between creed and inspiration, between self-surrender, self-discipline and self-realisation. But the law owes all its force to the sanction of the Gospel, and discipline and duty owe their meaning to the experiences of joy and the impulses of pity.

But we cannot stop at this communal sense, uniting man to man, nor at the sense of guardianship and responsibility which surely must increasingly modify both our actions and our affections towards the animal creation; for we and they are alike a part of the universal order of nature. The mystic vision of the Supreme, the sense of the totality of Being in which we and all exist, is a direct and permanent fact of the higher life of our souls. It may formulate itself in a thousand ways, theological or philosophic: it may strive to justify itself by creeds, or to support and stimulate itself by sacraments, but it is a primary and direct experience, the antecedents of which we may endeavour to discover, the implications of which we may strive to unfold and formulate, but which is itself the central experience

of the religious life. We belong to the Universe. We are at home in it, and the life of the Universe wakes the responsive throb in our own life. Francis transcended the limits of humanity in the love which hailed "Brother Sun" and "Sister Moon"; "Brother Fire" and "Sister Water" and "Mother Earth," as akin to himself because they lived and moved and had their being in the same universal life of which he was a part. And at bottom his voluntary poverty was not so much asceticism as a passionate sense of the obstructiveness of the swathings of possessions, and a longing to feel the naked touch of the great primary and elemental joys. Dante beheld in ecstatic vision all thing and all their relations, not in fragmentary incompleteness, but as one perfect whole. And in thus seeing, as one, the whole essential being of the Universe, he saw naught save the simple limpid flame of the Divine All-embracing Love. And his exile became his glory when he knew that he could only have kept his home in Florence by renouncing his fellowship with Heaven. And like experiences I suppose are represented by Nirvana of the early Buddhists, though their creed is said to be without a God. Nay, even Clifford, who professed himself a militant atheist, was no stranger to a "cosmic emotion" which carried him beyond himself and beyond humanity. And Comte, who had enthroned humanity as the Supreme Being, after telling us of the deep emotion with which the sensitive soul must welcome even the most elementary mathematical truth, with a sense of the support which it gives us—may we not add as of the "Everlasting Arms"—at the close of his life, sought to embrace the Earth and the great spaces of the Universe in his religious life, the one as the direct ally of man, and the other as the seat of the abstract laws on which all rests. The Psalmist "rejoices with trembling" in the presence of the Lord. But the materialist Lucretius, when he contemplates his universe of atoms and void, is "seized with a divine rapture, together with shuddering." This emotional relation to the sum of being, conceive it how we will, this sense of confidence and repose in the ultimate law and life of Being—is a fact that underlies and transcends all creeds.

In speaking of the narrower field of human fellowship, I have purposely used the cold word *social sense*, and not the warmer word of *love*, that we may realise that the experience is not that of the sainted few, but of the rank and file of the common-place many. If we now speak of the *cosmic sense* rather than of the *beatific vision*, does such a phrase seem to rob the Universe of its soul? When Wordsworth has told us of his early and unreflecting exultation in communion with nature, and then of his growing perception that Nature and Man are one, so that this rapturous sense was oftentimes "chastened and subdued" by "the still sad music of humanity," he tells us further that there is something "far more deeply interfused" in nature than this sense of humanity—something which embraces and interpenetrates Man and Nature in one life.



"I have felt

A presence that disturbs me with the joy  
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime  
Of something far more deeply interfused,  
Whose dwelling is the light of setting  
suns,

And the round ocean, and the living air,  
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:  
A motion and a spirit, that impels  
All thinking things, all objects of all  
thought,  
And rolls through all things."

Is this the *cosmic sense* or is it the *beatific vision*? Or are these but dialectic variations in the attempt to express the ineffable fact? Who that believes in God, doubts that the Buddhist's Nirvana is communion with him, or that Wordsworth's worship of Nature was communion with him, or that Clifford, Comte and Lucretius felt the breathing of his Spirit when their love rushed out to the cosmos? And who that understands with Wordsworth how the dreams and fictions of every fancied Utopia are transcended by the "simple produce of the common day," so soon as the "discerning intellect of Man is wedded to this goodly universe in love and holy passion," can fail to recognise his own experience in the ecstatic vision of the mystic? This sense of the beauty, and kinship to our very souls, of the life of the universe explains away none of the mysteries of suffering and sin and evil, but it brings out hitherto hidden tones of beauty in all the relations and experiences of life. It widens the area and deepens the quality of the life that it is good to live, and having been on the Mount of Vision, we are not more forlorn but more exultant in our sojourn on the plain. "The burden and the mystery," the "heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world" has been "lightened." We have seen into the life of things, and seen that it is good.

The creeds, religious and philosophical, may try to explain the mystery of Evil, but the theologies and philosophies owe their real vital force to their power of quickening our sense for Good. The Christian creed, broadly, and through the ages, has, as it seems to me, been the most ghastly pessimism that it has ever entered into the heart of man to conceive. For has it not preached an eternal hell for all save a chosen few? Yet, while *proclaiming* hell, it has given men the *sense* of heaven. And the everlasting Gospel has triumphed over the pessimistic Creed. Both the letter of the creed that strives in vain to kill, and the life of the Spirit that triumphs over it, are illustrated in the great epic of medieval Christianity—the Divine Comedy. What was the poet's belief? That souls crowded up on the banks of the infernal river, and before Charon had transported one load another was awaiting him. Whereas, during the three days and nights of the pilgrim's journey up the Mount of Purgatory, only once did the mountain shake to proclaim the passage of a soul to the Earthly, and then to the heavenly Paradise. Souls flowed to Hell in an unbroken torrent, and only dribbled into heaven, drop by drop. And yet no man can close the record of that divine vision without the sense of evil being swallowed up in the

sense of good, and feeling that darkness is lost in light. The poet has told us of the triumph of evil but has quickened our sense for good, so that we feel and touch its irresistible power and hail it as triumphant.

I have said that this sense of good underlies and transcends all creeds, but it must ever strive to express itself not only in assertions of experience, but in affirmations of belief. If this age is relatively creedless, it is in passionate search for a creed, but the new problem is not quite the old one. It is not now as in Anselm's days—faith seeking the intellect; it is the experience of the soul seeking to justify the objective facts of the Universe as relevant to itself.

And this is not a logical exercise or a metaphysical puzzle. It is an active going forth to conquer. Our creed must justify itself not by denying but by destroying evil. Our spirit seeks the life of the Universe and finds it akin to itself. Our aspiration and our love is as much a part of the order of things as the earthquake and the volcano. The blind forces of nature, as we call them, cannot explain away the vision of the soul; nor can the sin and strife of humanity explain away or destroy the sense of harmony.

Our intellectual perplexities cannot destroy our sense that in the good which our souls have known there lies the power of justifying the whole order of nature, and the proof that we are not only being thrust forward by material powers behind us, but drawn onward by a spirit above and before us. All that we have dreamed and aspired to is already there in the central life of the Universe, and may be here on this earth if we will that it shall be. That sense of the good that is, that will for the good that shall be, is the testimony of the Holy Spirit in our hearts. In measure as our own scheme of values as expressed in our life is brought into harmony with this sense and will for good;—in measure as the conscious effort or the unconscious influence of a harmonious life, within its own sphere assimilates evil to good, quenches the sources of vexation and fret, and raises life above small and evil things towards the eternal good, our hearts have felt the breath of the Holy Spirit and our lives preach the Everlasting Gospel.

WE confess, and that with joy and confidence, that the more we penetrate to the fundamental, incorrupt, vivifying ideas of all religions, the more we recognise their essential identity. We feel that the work of Christ and Christianity was not to impose a new form of faith upon the consciences of mankind, but to deepen the lines of old belief, to lend all spiritual aspirations a fresh power of flight, to give a more definite form and a more assured permanence to former yearnings after God. If in any sense Christ were "the desire of all nations," it could not be because he decisively cut athwart their finest thoughts and best hopes, but because they came to feel that these were really fulfilled and made more in him, and that he enabled them to see, what before they were only feeling after, if haply they might find it.—*Charles Beard.*

## THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

By PROFESSOR HENRY JONES.

I HAVE been asked to introduce a discussion on "The Problem of Evil," and I am sure you will not think it out of place if I say a word or two in explanation of what must seem the presumptuous rashness of my obedience. Well! it was obedience, for the subject was suggested to me by some of your friends and mine whom it is a privilege to obey. Besides, I thought it probable that no one in this assembly would be entitled to cast a stone at me; for are you, too, not engaged in dealing with "the problem of evil," and dealing with it, not in theory only, but in the concrete and much more difficult ways of practical life? Then, I was glad to make use of an opportunity of mingling amongst men and women who are not afraid of following the lead of their own sincere thought in whatever dark and difficult enterprise, but who are sure that so long as they are seeking for Truth they are in the right way and in the right service. For this is a meeting of Free Churches; free, not merely in the relatively insignificant sense of not being officially attached to the State, but in a far deeper sense—free with that large liberty which comes from the faith that Religion is so majestically steadfast in its own truth that it can sustain enquiry; that its treasures are so vast that, more and more, as enquiry deepens and the spiritual experience of man matures, they will endow him with their superlative rewards. For its mysteries are very great, and they are meant for an inheritance into which we can enter without exhausting; for we know that there are still greater splendours ever on before. It is *Superstition* whose mysteries insult and flout the reason of man, and finds in that reason its mortal foe. But *Religion* is a wisdom which surpasseth understanding, and you have not confused it with the credulousness which is beneath the understanding. It surpasseth it by overflowing it, for it is like the open ocean or the universal day. It stands in no fear of man's little mind. It presses in upon the windows of the soul, like the pure air, and invites us to throw them open. It has not to hide itself behind the bulwarks of ancient authority, nor to defend itself with the weapons of sophistry. There needs no argument in support of Religion, except the argument of Philip to Nathanael—"Come and see." I am glad to stand with you at the foot of the "Banner of Religious Liberty."

But there was another reason why my friends invited me and I agreed to speak on this subject. There is a suspicion abroad that Idealists deny the existence of evil or seek to minimise its significance and extract its sting. And the suspicion is altogether natural. Idealism, as I understand it, is a profound faith in the spiritual significance of the world and of the mind of man. It is not merely an arid and pedantic doctrine of the schools, but a conviction which will brook no compromise, an assurance that will not grow faint, that even though the sins of man and the sufferings of the world rise up continually obscuring the high



heavens, the everlasting stars are still shining; a conviction shared by Plato and Aristotle, by Isaiah and St. Paul, by Spinoza and Hegel, by Goethe and Carlyle, by Wordsworth and Browning, by Wallace, Green and Caird, and held, too, by one who, travelling on the way to ignominious death, amidst the humblest band of disciples that ever followed a Great Master, yet said to them "Be ye of good cheer, I have overcome the world." There is diversity of tongues amongst the Idealists, as amongst other exponents of great causes, for it takes many minds to reflect the many phases of deep truths. But their faith is in its intrinsic elements one and the same; it makes the same appeal to the intelligence, it exercises the same control over conduct, it awakens the same aspirations and sustains the same trust.

But in these days the validity of that faith is being deeply questioned. Its emotional value is not denied, for such a faith offers an incomparable anodyne to the suffering heart of man. Happy are those who can entertain it. Were it unobjectionable otherwise, who would disturb it.

"Leave thou thy sister when she prays  
Her early Heaven, her happy views,  
Nor thou with shadow'd hint confuse  
A life that leads melodious days."

But we are told that it does such violence to the intelligence of man, contradicts his experience so flagrantly, and so paralyses his moral nature that men who love the good of their kind must assail it. For it is an Optimism. It is, in the last resort, faith in what the philosophers call the *Absolute*, and in One whom religious spirits have always worshipped as the Great Good God, whose power and wisdom are over all the earth, whose purposes are full of loving kindness towards all created things and cannot fail. For that Absolute we are asked to substitute a Relative and finite Being, whose attributes comport better with our own limited nature; and instead of the God in whom our trust knew no bounds, we are asked to worship another. He also is good and great, but he is not altogether good nor altogether great, but tainted with finitude, touched with weakness, and not perfect in any way. "For what evidence have ye of any other?" they ask. How can there be any other when the world is so full of pain, and the history of mankind looked at as it stands before us is one vast tragedy, stumbling onwards along its blind course throughout the ages? Your Optimism is without defence from reason, or support from experience. You cannot know what is perfect, for there is no evidence of its operation anywhere. If God were perfect, where is there room or need for your help in redeeming the world from its errors? Is not the sense of comradeship in the struggle, with one who is on our side, and yet needs the feeble warfare of our weapons, more inspiring and more ethically worthy than that empty and imaginary assurance in a foregone conclusion, which turns the moral struggle into a sham fight against mere passing shadows? The optimism of the Idealist hardens the heart and stultifies sympathy, for it

belittles the woes of mankind, and even thinks that they are for its good. "Our light affliction," in the words of one of the greatest of them, "which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

You are acquainted with these arguments, and with the eloquence and ardour with which they are urged, and perhaps you have felt it difficult to meet them, their logical cogency seems so obvious. That they are not new, not any one of them, is no proof that they are not valid. I like arguments which can stand some wear and tear. Nothing has such toughness of fibre as the truth; and difficulties which have been felt by good men in all the ages of the world are not unreal. Moreover, though the arguments are not new, they come upon us with new power in these days, and there is a sense in which those who urge them are true exponents of their times, and speak its message.

A deep ethical and religious change has come over the spirit of our age, rendering obsolete much of both the faith and the fears of the times which have passed. There are doctrines which have suffered the deepest of all refutations; for our experience has outgrown them. We neither attack nor defend them, any more than the opinions of our childhood, for they have lost all serious weight. Such is the "Individualism" in social and in religious life, which had good men not been always better than their narrow creed, would have isolated them from one another and made them indifferent to one another's destiny. Such is the *Hedonism* that confused between moral goodness and pleasant feelings, and yet, in its day, was so beneficent a creed in the hands of statesmen. Such also is Deism, the adoration of a Sovereign Will with no law save its own caprice, and in whom Justice was paramount over and not the instrument of the Love it limited, but which graciously offered eternal life to all, and effectively to some. These beliefs have lost interest as well as cogency. They have fallen away from our experience, like clinging plants which are dead and withered. The thoughts of men have been moralised; they think more generously of themselves, and more humanely of their God. There is now spread abroad through all men's better minds a sense of the solidarity of the human race, a far more intimate consciousness of brotherhood and conviction of the oneness of its ultimate destiny. There is a complete assurance that if there be a God at all, He is not merely a Moral Governor, but "Our Father," bound with all His children in the bonds of everlasting Love, revealing Himself, not sporadically and capriciously here and there, but in all human history—or in none; nay, making nature itself the vehicle of His purpose, and the heart of man His dwelling place, lifting him thereby, as living ideals always will, into the freedom and joy of perfect obedience. The doctrine of His *Immanence*, which is our newer and nearer view of His *Omnipresence*, is the priceless centre of our Faith; and the only alternative that remains. For we know that the Deism

which placed God beyond the realms of finite beings could only be the phantom ruler of an empty kingdom. It is utterly without defence against the Scepticism which denies and the Agnosticism which dare not affirm.

But the penalty—and reward—of progress are harder trials: wider responsibilities for widened natures, and deeper doubts for a greater faith. Because sympathy has broadened and the thoughts of man have become more generous, and God has been brought near, the problem of evil has become more intolerable. How, we must ask, can God manifest Himself amidst the miseries? What manner of Being is He who should call this world into being and dwell therein? Must not either His power or his will for good be finite?

It is precisely this contradiction, this collision between the demands of faith and the testimony of our experience which, I take it, is the essence of what we call "The Problem of Evil." We know not well how either to solve the contradiction or how to reject either of the contradicting elements. We seem to be forced to the hardest choice. On the one side there is the concrete, palpable, universal, absolutely indubitable witness of our experience to our own lives and to that of our brethren everywhere. Taken as they veritably are, they are so weak, so burdened, so weary, driven hither and thither in thick darkness by powers they cannot control, and to a destiny which is uncertain; their ideals so high, their aspirations so divine, their attainments at the best so meagre, and the grave so sure. On the other side there is the one God in whom is man's only hope; who for every religious spirit has stood always as the symbol of all perfection. For it is quite certain that the limited divinity proffered to us in his stead is not a "God." He operates upon an environment which he did not make, and either cannot or will not control, and he is himself the effect of something prior, for he is not self-determining. In both respects he is dependent on some prior and wider power, as even those who speak of him are constrained to admit, and to that wider power the name God—or Destiny—must be transferred. Besides, such a limited deity can certainly never be known. Interpreting experience as his worshippers do, they can find therein no evidence of the operation of any powers except man's own, and those of the contingent world with which these interact. If God is, He is the presupposition of all experience and its ultimate principle, and not one amongst many of its objects. The least scrutiny will show that this New Theology is incapable of standing the strain either of religious faith or of philosophical criticism. It is a mixture of scepticism and credulousness.

There can be no profit in endeavouring to mitigate the impact of the contradictory elements, or in obscuring the magnitude of the issues which have been raised. No compromise can avail. We can moderate neither the reality of evil, nor the absoluteness of God. Apparently we must strive somehow to live without a God; the sad still music of humanity must



be for us meaningless as "the moanings of the homeless sea,"

"And Time, a maniac scattering dust;  
And Life, a fury slinging flame?"<sup>22</sup>

or, on the other hand, we must believe that which we cannot believe, that all the pain, and hunger, and terror of the innocent brutes, and all the deserved and undeserved miseries of man's lot, the pitifulness and meanness of his inner life at its worst, and the pathos of its failure at the best, are all imaginary—the dance of shadows on the curtain of eternity.

Verily it is a hard choice; and it is pressed upon us by our own growing faith in God and sympathy with our fellow beings. What can be done?

First, we shall be intellectually honest at all costs. For come what will, that course can not be wrong. And that course prevents us once for all from rejecting, or even in any way minimising the significance of the testimony of our experience to the reality of evil. I shall not waste your time in discussing any such way of escape. But perhaps I may say in passing that religious optimists and idealists have never even looked in that direction. It may be illogical, and incoherent, and inconsequent on their part to maintain at once an absolutely sure faith in God and the reality of evil—they have, at any rate, been conspicuous throughout all the ages for this splendid inconsequence. They have said, all of them in their own way: "God's in His heaven; all's right with the world." But that belief has not taken the ardour from their moral struggle; that faith has never hardened the heart, or sent men to seek amongst the miseries. Their belief in their Captain and their Cause, their Certainty of the Victory, has even made them strike for the good more ringingly. "The greatest Optimist the world ever saw was the Man of Sorrows"<sup>23</sup>; the most certain of the evil of evil, and of the absolute power of Infinite Love. It is distrust, agnostic unbelief, and sceptical disbelief that bring first despair, then indifference, then callousness of heart and moral death. You need fear none of these results from the ancient faith. They are the fabrications of thin logic, and have no support form the experience of mankind. Experience teaches quite otherwise.

But can we say nothing to justify this faith? Must we simply let the contradiction stand? I don't think so, my friends. I will even say that the problem of evil is not insoluble, except when it is rendered so by our own unexamined presuppositions. And perhaps the best, or indeed, the only useful thing I can do in what remains of our time together is to point out some of these presuppositions, and indicate the direction in which I believe we may look, as man's acquaintance with spiritual things becomes more intimate and sincere, for clearer light.

(1) No sooner is it admitted that evil is real—real in as true a sense as any other element of our experience is real—than it is presupposed, without any inquiry or proof, that evil is permanently real and cannot be overcome.

This presupposition is tremendous in its consequences, and it is so contradictory

to the great mass of our experience of other things than evil that we must look at it. The evil deed done can never be undone, our critics will say. It goes on reverberating in the soul of man, and in the world into which he has projected it for evermore, and cannot be torn out of the warp and woof of history. If deep contrition has lifted us beyond its power, still there is sorrow and shame, and the vain cry, "Would that I had never done it!" Granted to the full, I would reply. But to grant this is not to grant its *fixed*, unalterable permanence. Evil persists only by passing into its consequences, whatever those are; whether they be deeper wading in further evil or the benign fruits of repentance. That Cæsar once did cross the Rubicon is a fact, and will always be a fact, and its consequences still live in history. But the event itself has passed away, and it lives now *only* in its consequences. Not otherwise is it with an act that is morally evil, or, indeed, with an act that is morally right and good. Both evil and good in the moral sense persist only by constant reproduction; they are expressions, fleeting in themselves, of a living will, and *persist* only in their modifications of that will in the way they strike back on character. You cannot call a man a good man after he has ceased to *will* the good; if he willed it yesterday, or last year, but wills the good no more. He has fallen away! On the other hand, and for the same reason (and is this not as invaluable a conviction as it is true), if there be any place in this universe of ours, or any possibility in the soul by which it can turn away from the ill deeds it has done, in sorrow, in contrition, and in deep revolt, turning its back upon its solicitations, silencing the passions and crucifying the desires, nay, dedicating them to God's own cause, then I say that, in the same sense, the man who does this can in that respect not be called evil. The Puritanism of the past has given a permanence and finality to evil which it denied to the "good," and contradicting evident facts of experience, engendered despair instead of strengthening the helpless and sin-stained with hope.

There is not one item in man's experience, whether of his ignorance or his knowledge, his doubt or his faith, his evil or his good, which is not in flux. His life and all its contents are in perpetual change, and persist through constant transmutation.

Men have hypostatized evil as if it were a miasma, or exhalation, that sat motionless and poisonous over the marsh of human life. But evil is nothing in itself; it is no independent existent; it is a product of volition. Cease to will it, and you are in God's own open sunshine! There is a false indulgence in remorse. Let the dead bury be; will the good. "Let the dead bury their dead. Follow thou me!"

If this be not possible; then is all the endeavour for the good of the world vain. Evil is real, but it can be overcome. This, I maintain, and not anything else, is the testimony of experience.

2. "You are going too fast and walking away too triumphantly," our opponents may reply. "You have indicated

that all the elements of man's experience are in themselves transitory and persist only in being transmuted, and that there is no moral evil nor moral good, except they be the volitions of a living will; but you have not said anything to show why good should prevail over evil, or evil be overcome. Neither is fixed, it is true, but, on the other hand, they both alike persist in their consequences." Is not the struggle of good and evil, though their forms are in constant change, as permanent as man's history, and perhaps immortal? Where is the victory of the good? Where is peace? Nay, what can peace mean? Will it not mean that there is no further evil to overcome or good to seek; nothing that ought to be except that which is? No duty to strive after; no moral life any more? Good and evil are relative. They exist because they are in conflict. Destroy either and you destroy both. Your optimism has but to complete itself, to stultify itself, in a Pyrrhic victory.

\* I answer "Granted" once more. I grant their mutual relativity in our experience, to the full; and it is to our experience that you have appealed, and within it that the gauge of battle has been thrown. Setting aside all fair dreams of what may lie beyond experience, looking for no evidence except what it may yield, I admit that good and evil are so intimately correlative that they subsist only through their opposition. Their correlation gives them being, and you can demand no deeper or fuller admission.

But I would point out another unexamined presupposition in your argument. You assume without proof, and even without examination, that things which are essentially correlative must also be equipollent; and this assumption cannot be proved, for it is not true. Experience refutes it. On every hand I can see correlatives that are essential to one another, which nevertheless are not on a par. Means are essential to ends and ends to means, but they are not on a par; organ is essential to organism and organism to organ; environment is essential to life and life to environment; object is essential to subject and subject to object, in knowledge; sense is essential to intelligence and intelligence to sense in our experience; passion to reason and reason to passion; nature to spirit and spirit to nature; the finite to the infinite and the infinite to the finite; but they are not equipollent. Ends have mastery over the means they need; life employs the environment which it must have, and transmutes it for its use; the subject is lord of the object, and sets free its meaning; and spirit which needs nature elicits its glory and is sovereign over it. Parent and child, master and servant, king and subject—there is hardly a human relation in which elements are not necessary for one another, and yet one of them has priority over the other.

Why is it assumed that the like may not be the case with good and evil? I grant their correlation in our finite experience, but I await proof of their parity.\*

\* I would also warn against a hasty application to the infinite—to God, of what is true of the finite; for what is true of the parts may not be true of the whole; and what may be true of



It is possible that evil may be subordinate to good or good to evil, or even that evil is means to good, or good to evil. That is a question which still has to be decided before we can deny that evil can be overcome.

3. "But I refuse to entertain that supposition," our opponents will reply. "It is this intolerable sophistry of making evil the means of good which ever marks the optimist. If we 'learn through evil that good is best,' as one of your poets says, then let us do evil that good may follow. Surely, this is to justify evil; to render all opposition to it itself an evil, and to confuse the whole region of the moral consciousness of man."

Is there any answer to this objection? Let us look around to matters less vital, where prejudice and impatience are therefore not too strong to preclude quiet looking and earnest search. I believe you will find here once more a truth which is marred and deformed by an unexamined presupposition. The assumption is that a thing which is justified as means is justified in itself, and apart from the end which is reached by its use. But is the assumption true? Is there any one here who would say—and now I am sure that I touch very nearly the most natural of natural men—that the heavy taxation with which the empire is burdened is good in itself? You would reply at once "In itself it is bad, but you must not judge it in itself; you must look at it in relation to the ends to which the products of taxation are employed. I do not object to the taxation that maintains public justice, that defends the liberty and independence of the empire, that educates the children, that protects the feeble, and helps to comfort the declining years of aged industry!" You justify such taxation as means; while you would condemn it in itself, were it not unreasonable to pass any judgment at all upon it in itself. And life is full of such instances. Is punishment good in itself? Are the pains of sympathy and the tragic toil of loving natures for broken and almost hopeless lives, good in themselves? Is the negation of natural impulse, the way of self-denial, the taking up the burden and the cross, good in itself? Not even the most ascetic moralists have taught this or advocated the immolation of the self for its own sole sake. They seek an end beyond, and the end transmutes the means. "As it is written: For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." "Five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck. Weariness and painfulness and watchings, hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness," and on the summit of them all "the care of the Churches:" these be things in which the Great Apostle boasts. Such alchemy lay in the end that it made these things right. And it is only

the process of the ideal may not be true of the ideal. At the least there is a matter for inquiry, and no conclusion can be assumed as a matter of course. But it is not the subject of our present inquiry; dealing as we are with man's experience, and not with problems of the life of God; or the nature of the Absolute.

in its relation to the end that means can be judged at all. All other judgments, tearing matters out of their context, are entirely untrustworthy. In estimating any act, we must strive to take it up in the whole of its compass and context; apart from which none can be called either good or bad, or true or false, or worthy or unworthy, in any sense of the term—whether it be a movement in a piece of music, an element in a picture, a step in a proof, or an action in a life.

4. But, it will be asked: "Granting that this is true, do you mean that a morally bad act can be means to a morally good end? The evils you cited as having been suffered by St. Paul—the stripes, the stoning, the hunger, thirst, nakedness, and cares, are none of them moral evils. Man may undergo physical suffering for the sake of the good, but he cannot serve the good by doing himself moral injury. And it would be well to remember—that we never do good to others by that which degrades ourselves—a fact not always borne in mind, e.g., by those who are engaged in the ambiguous adventures and party strifes of the political life. Man can never advance the morally good by doing what is morally wrong."

I again grant this with my whole heart. But once more I should like to point to unexamined presuppositions when the admission is employed against the Idealist.

(a) The first of these is that the attitude of mind assumed in such a case can be possible. It is really impossible, because it is self-contradictory. It violates what we have just shown to be the only rule of rational judgment. The end is considered by itself, and the means are considered by themselves; whereas an action has to be judged as a whole, and in the last resort it has only one character.

(b) The second presupposition is more manifestly important, and it is the last which time permits me to mention. It is a presupposition which, if true, leaves Idealism in all its forms—the Idealism which is practical and tries to raise the lives of men to a higher level, and which breathes in every devout heart, no less than the theoretical Idealism of the theologian and philosopher. It is the assumption that men do what is evil because it is evil. If anywhere a man can be found who seeks no good through his act or who seeks a false good because of its falsity, then the Idealist, from Plato down to this day, must hold out empty hands:

"An infant crying in the night:  
An infant crying for the light:  
And with no language but a cry."

But the whole experience of mankind furnishes no such sample. Deeply as man has sinned, preferring all manner of meanness to the glorious service, that kind of preference he has never made. Evil as evil, loss as loss, a worse because it is worse, is not a possible motive for human action. In every act, however low, or cruel, or passionate, in every monstrous and defiant crime that has raised its head against the high heavens, the motive, if the act was conscious, that is, if the man did it, was some foolish, confused, tragical dream of something to be gained by it. In speaking of man we must not forget the qualities of man; and a being

who willed evil because of its evil, supposing such a being to be possible, were not a man.

"Dragons of the prime;  
That tare each other in their slime,  
Were mellow music match'd with him."

Speaking of such a being, we are once more in the region of conjecture, beyond the bounds of experience; and neither the instance nor the criticism counts in rational argument.

But if it be true, as it seems it must, that even in the drunken sleep of sin it is some foolish dream of an impossible and misnamed good which serves as motive, then there is hope for man. In that case there is that in man which circumstance can foster, and feed into clearer flame: there is the love of the good if he could only recognise the good, which love can seize and use. He may be enlightened yet; for the conditions are present.

"Beneath the veriest ash there hides a spark  
Which, quickened by love's breath, may yet pervade the whole  
O' the grey, and, free again, be fire; of worth the same,  
How'er produced, for, great or little, flame is flame."

What between the marvel of man's soul within, the rational nature which cannot be put out and leave him man, and the spinning wheel of circumstance without; what between the undying need of good, the thirst that can not be slaked by evil, and the great, rich, wondrous world without to respond to it; I think that the Idealist can hold to his hypothesis.

## THE WIDER MEANING OF MODERNISM.

### I.

By THE REV. J. M. LLOYD THOMAS.

Roman Catholic Modernism, almost protean in its forms, has expressed itself mainly in two broadly-sweeping tendencies. It is, first, a movement to emancipate the Christian from the scholastic oppression of the Middle Ages. It is, secondly, a movement to emancipate the man from the industrial oppression of to-day. It is not merely an intellectual awakening in the Church, it is also a social awakening in the world. The excommunicated French priest Loisy gives it brilliant exposition through Biblical and ecclesiastical scholarship, but the excommunicated Italian priest Murri gives it far more popular utterance in active political life, through what may be described as Christian Socialism. It would not be entirely misleading to say that Italian Modernism is mainly, though not exclusively, motivated by a religious enthusiasm for National and Social Reform, while outside it is mainly, though not exclusively, a philosophical and theological tendency.

Perhaps we shall avoid confounding the persons and dividing the substance if we make the general statement that it is everywhere a movement towards greater vigour and veracity of thought, a democratic revolt against political and ecclesiastical decadence, a reaching forth toward



human freedom and spontaneity; a new quest of the spirit for the sources of moral power and of spiritual joy. The Ancient Church, which many had pictured as a toothless witch crooning in a corner of the hearthstone of Western Civilisation, and muttering dreadful incantations, is now being transformed into a radiant figure of youth that dances out of the dawn with cymbals and with shawms.

But youth ever raises more problems than it can solve, as the child asks more questions than it or its parents can ever answer. This Catholic Renaissance, superbly ambitious and eloquent in its inquiries, is remarkably modest and reticent in its replies. In the largeness of its promise and in the meagreness of its present fulfilment, it does not differ at all, except to its own advantage, from Liberal Protestantism. Here, also, penetrating analysis has only left the old problems still on our hands. Revelation, tradition, the natural and the supernatural, Church and State, ecclesiastical authority, dogma, discipline, ritual, symbolism—not one of those has been satisfactorily settled. They are dismissed in one decade only to rise again in another. On some of these themes I do not believe that absolute finality is attainable; on others I think a variety of judgments is not only inevitable, but desirable, adding colour and activity to our common life. It would be disastrous to attempt to dragoon men into a regimented uniformity. Uniformity would be stagnation, and stagnation would be death. But it can be said of us, and surely it is a noble thing to say, that we are providing the beginnings of an undogmatic Church-life, which, though not in itself a solution of these pressing problems, is at any rate a promising condition for that manifold fulness of religious being, and for that salutary interchange and criticism of theological opinion which alone can give even an approximately satisfactory solution. The fresh upland breezes of a Free Catholicism offer a better medium in which to do our thinking on these obstinate riddles, than the stifling atmosphere of the Roman and Anglican hierarchies, or the smug air of Evangelical dissent.

And here the Modernists are essentially even when not verbally at one with us. Some of them may still talk of a *depositum fidei* and of a dogmatic revelation, and the reason for this is clear. It is required by the present situation and by the facts of the past. If they are to talk of development at all, they must use some presupposition, some norm or standard to distinguish a legitimate and healthy growth from a diseased and malignant tumour. It is necessary for them just as it is necessary for all Christians to find in Christianity (however they may subsequently or antecedently universalise it) the most appealing revelation of Divine love that God has ever given in history.

But when it comes to the interpretation of this supreme and fundamental fact, the Modernists feel as we do, that the older systems have shivered to splinters. The fabric of orthodoxy has collapsed as completely for them as for us. In their dreams they have already entered the Vatican, and, seeing the crosier of official infallibility, have cried, "Take away,

that bauble!" They feel the force of the negative and destructive logic of our age as poignantly as we do. They assign the same causes for the general disintegration and decay. The Biblical scholasticism of the Protestants no less than the ecclesiastical scholasticism of the Romanists, has been quietly left behind by the march of civilisation. The old views have been rendered obsolete by the mere diffusion and increment of culture. Even when not logically overthrown, they have been vitally outgrown and overgrown. Through the sheer advancement of human life some of the central orthodox doctrines have been discredited, and are no longer for the mass of men even live hypotheses. This operation has been aided (when not constituted) by the steady progress of science with its commercial and mechanical triumphs, by Biblical criticism and the comparative study of world-religions, by the popular extension of education, by the growth of the secular and rationalistic spirit with its distrust of clericalism and ecclesiastical domination.

But if the older thought has broken down, can we venture to say that any newer thought stands? Can the victors sustain their victory now that it has been won; can they colonise the enemy's territory with docile subjects and prevent a fresh incursion of the hordes of the Irrational? It seems to me that in this respect we are less confident than we used to be. The primary assumptions of Naturalism, no less than those of Supernaturalism, are being subjected to criticism. Deep in man, and inexpugnable, is a resurgent mystical super-rational element that will not tolerate your iron universe of mechanical uniformity. To the mind never unawed by mystery such a universe is too artificial and too superficial. After the lapse of a few years it presents a shop-soiled appearance. Man's freedom stirs him again into a lyrical wonder, and wonder initiates a reconsideration of the whole meaning of the miraculous. The rollicking days of Huxley already belong to a far away past—some time after the Flood. The good old times of the jolly freethinkers are lost in the haze of history. We speak of them as having lived in the dim Darwinian and pre-Chesterton age. The agnostic cocksureness, the dogmatic Nescience of the Mid-Victorian sceptics, "doubtful in their faith, but faithful in their doubt," has given place on the one hand to a depreciation of the validity of reasoning, and to a despondent sense of the vanity of thinking. As an interpretation of reality, Science with its conceptual short-hand, its fixities, snap-shots, and abstract configurations, is confessedly bankrupt. Rationalism, the noblest of the superstitions, has long ago lost its vigour and self-confidence, while Ethical Culture has become a thing too dismal for tears. On the other hand, this downfall of naturalistic positivism has released the suppressed instinct for mystery and romance. Faith, held so long in leash, leaps forward again bounding with joy. Philosophy and theology take heart, and gird themselves for a new enterprise. New systems are in travail, if also powerless to be born. The Absolute Idealists are on the defensive. It is the day of Pragmatism and pluralistic hypotheses. Agnosticism

has at last become sufficiently thorough and true to itself to deepen reverently into religious mysticism. With the revival of mysticism, we have a fresh and prolific crop of interesting cults, Oriental, American, esoteric and occult, such as theosophy, Christian Science, higher thought, spiritualism, with cross-correspondences—sometimes rudely cross. Scarcely are the old credulities cold enough for burial before new ones darken our horizon. Ananias has hardly been carried out before Saphira turns up smiling and bold as brass. No sooner do we exorcise one superstition than seven others more children of hell than itself possess the garnished temple. In the midst of this weltering insecurity, this morass of contradictory ideas, serious men bent on the business of living are feeling for firm footing and long for a steady body of stable doctrine. The rebels, driven to despair by the success of their own anarchy, are clamouring for order and the guillotine, for some strong silent man to quell the shouting and the tumult.

But others who were never rebels at heart, but pray rather that ere they see death they may find peace, are by the very frailty of their faith driven to a defiant *intransigence* of attitude. The weakness within becomes a bravado of dogma without. The timidity of their interior trust becomes an exterior cry for creedal Dreadnoughts. The inner instability, the hard struggle with a hidden unbelief, the anguish of a conflict with a secret doubt still writhing for supremacy in the heart—gives a deceptive expression of strength and self-mastery to the outer countenance. These are *sculs at bay*, and it is the very futility of their fight that makes them turn and flash their teeth. The temper of intellectual despair breaks away from an intolerable hesitancy only by a resolute act of reckless self-committal. This counter-attack of dogma upon Liberalism (conceived as a latitudinarian indifference) has already begun, and will probably characterise the immediate future of religious controversy. The fight will, I fear, be bitter, unchivalrous, and without quarter. But it is quite safe to say that the revival of dogma is foredoomed to nothing better than a sectional and temporary triumph. The strong body of doctrine will not come by raising again the old creeds from their grave.

Neither will it come by the mere fabrication of new creeds. To say with a square jaw and through clenched teeth "I believe in God" is no more a cure for Atheism, than to slap your chest in the morning and say "I am Healthy" is a guarantee of physical well-being.

We have a striking effort in creed-making in the current *Hibbert Journal*, accompanied by an article of ringing challenge with which, except in opinion, I differ in nothing. But it must be remembered that a creed, to be really dogmatic, cannot also retain for itself the advantage of an open door. A theology which is to be irrevocable cannot also be progressive in its outlook or be permitted to conclude with the confession that its creed is, after all, "incomplete, sufficing for present knowledge but falling short of the glory that shall be revealed." It



cannot claim to be absolute, and say that "other words shall be given though we cannot bear them now." Nor can it profess finality, and yet admit that there is a "fuller vision yet to be." For no words can possibly be given in the future, which will not modify the meaning of the present statement; nor can anything strictly suffice for present knowledge, if it is already smitten through and through with a sense of incompleteness. No fuller Vision or Glory to be revealed can be a mere addendum or appendix to that which has gone before, and which we already possess. The mere anticipation of increasing illumination already vitiates the claim to absolute irrevocableness, and turns it into an expectancy of new truth. We must choose freedom or fixity, life or death, and make our choice in the clear knowledge that a progressive theology means a continuous adaptation and readjustment to the new increment of faith, an undying reconstruction of the reality of religion, and a working of it up age by age, nay, moment by moment, into the vital organism of the Church. To counsel ecclesiastical creeds or suggest dogmatic and irrevocable statements of doctrine as a way out of our confusion, would be to counsel despair and invite our Modern Israel to return once more to the harlotry of idols.

But I am perfectly sure that the author of the Credo is not going to offer that or any other creed to our free churches. I believe I have good reason for saying that nothing could be further from his intentions. He has given us a noble expression of individual belief—a *Credo* not a *Credimus*. Nor does he dream of asking for a dogmatic or irrevocable theology. It is *religion* not theology that must contain "something dogmatic, authoritative, irrevocable, even defiant." It is what *religion* announces not by way of mere intellectualist theology but by way of *vital prophecy* that "may not be withdrawn, modified, or made the subject of negotiation under any circumstance whatsoever." That is why I say that "except in opinion" I entirely agree. I respond with enthusiasm to this martial spirit, and welcome with humble and admiring gratitude its piercing note of challenge and defiance. I would go even further; the high and austere temper of intellectual seriousness, the sense of the tremendous importance of doctrine as well as the passionate conviction that speaks not *by* but *with* authority—these must be ours on pain of perishing. One of the wider and deeper meanings of Modernism is to be found here. It is a call from the peaks to all liberal theologians to realise the terrible exactingness of their faith, to join in a fearless mental co-operation, to think affirmatively and constructively together, not *in vacuo*, but within the consciousness of the continuity and solidarity of the Christian communion. In this heroic labour of thought the Modernists have an immense advantage over detached, critical Rationalists. For the Modernists are in the deepest possible sympathy with the unbroken spiritual communion of the Church. They feel the power of a silent democracy of departed souls. Behind them is a rich background frescoed with the loveliness of saintly lives, mosaiced with the agonies of

centuries of Christian conflict, arrased with the crimsoned tapestry of many martyrdoms and purpled with the distance and the mist of a dim classical antiquity. They feel the movement of the river of ages; they are immersed in the stream of the Church's everlastingness. Its living tradition is the air beaten by the wings of their prayers, its immemorial voice is the chant of their devotions. Their life is haunted for ever by a historic Presence which is more than a personification, if not, indeed, quite a personality. She is a Being to serve with loyalty, a Mother to love with adoration.

They seek, therefore, not to destroy, but to fulfil her authority, to substitute for the false authority of a Vatican circle of obscurantists, the true authority of the living consciousness of the Church. This presupposes a great deal; among other things a change from an aristocratic into a democratic sentiment. It demands a genuine Christian liberty within which men and women may do their thinking fearless of all consequence except error. Such an authority would contain within itself by the very nature of its composition what Henry Sidgwick found in scientific authority, namely, adequate guarantees for the elimination of error by continual self-questioning and self-criticism. It must not be an authority that pretends to promulgate final and irrevocable dogmas. On the contrary, it must encourage to the utmost any well-reasoned criticism of the most fundamental of its teachings. It is only this kind of authority that educated persons can ever again respect. But, in the words of Harnack, "*The auctoritas interpretiva* is invariably the supreme and real authority." If, therefore, it be asked who or what is the interpretative organ of this authority, I answer by asking, Who is to-day the interpretative organ of any other science? No one, because *everyone*; everyone, because no *one*. The theological authority of the future, like any other scientific authority, will be a collective authority exerted by the unconstrained consensus of the competent and interpreted by the competent. And even in matters not merely intellectual, in matters of vital spiritual faith, the Church can only pronounce with authority precisely in proportion as she actually possesses it, and so can command a hearing and elicit a spiritual response from her devoted children—in proportion, that is to say, as she is herself an inspired prophet with an open vision, and not a mere priest, making void the instant Word of God by the traditions of men.

And this brings me, somewhat belated, to my second point. It is the absence of this inspired prophetic authority that accounts in large measure for the emptiness and sterility of the churches. They have lost the allegiance and even the respect of some of the most earnest and beautiful spirits of our time. Numbers of men and women, ardent and passionate for reform, have left the ranks of organised religion, and others hasten to follow them. They looked to the Church to bear testimony like the Hebrew prophets, on themes that touch to the quick nerve our national and social life. They trusted that it was she who should redeem Israel, that it

was she who should defend the cause of the disinherited and the oppressed, and vindicate her own right and duty to speak as the organ of the Good Shepherd of the people. They challenged the Church to stand for her own central idea of the Kingdom of God, and now they claim to have detected her moral insolvency.

I do not confuse this cry of the democracy with the particular body of economic doctrines known as Socialism—though I think it only just to say that the Socialists deserve no small amount of the credit for having waked us out of our stupor. But the challenge itself is broader and deeper than that of an economic doctrine; it is a human and moral demand for a life worth living for all. I know enough of these social idealists to say that they are not, on the whole, an irreligious people. It was Julian the Apostate who spoke of "these godless Galileans"; it is the apostate Christian who now speaks of "these godless Socialists." I am not sure whether I know what these modern Christian apostates mean by the word "God," but if it still means the first and the last loyalty of our being, if it still means a life that claims you beyond agony and beyond death, if it means a Commander of the forces of Righteousness, if it means the flame of Love at the heart of the universe, if it means the King of the Ideal Kingdom—then these reformers are, in my opinion, nearer to God than many of us who are within the churches. Their social faith is for them a glowing and a joyous life. It is the call of the promise of the future. It has all the adventurousness, all the romance, and, alas, all the tragedy, of a Crusade. It is shot through with the same fidelities and the same betrayals. Their very quarrels resemble nothing so much as those of the early councils of the Church. Spite of all, they gather to themselves colour and art and poetry and song. They have the gaiety of the heart that believes. They are about the only people in the modern world who are confident enough to laugh at their own foibles, who are faithful enough to be frivolous about their own faith. The eyes of other reformers may be dim with disillusion and decrepitude. These have the silver gleam of the dawn and the wild pulse of youth. And they come to the youth of our churches and say, Let the dead bury their dead, but come ye and preach the kingdom of God. And some of the finest minds among us listen, and while listening begin to suspect that the Church has indeed betrayed her Christ and repudiated the folly of his Cross, that organised religion has become a confederate hypocrisy which assumes the permanence of the present social conditions; which, for comfort's sake, accepts the modern situation, and which with easy resignation contemplates the existing industrial order as an inevitable and irreformable structure. To the children of the modern revolt the Church has become a negligible upper and middle-class institution, and its vision a respectable and prosperous vision of things as they are, made a trifle more tolerable by a little more charity and slightly more benign by a little more good-fellowship. The pang of the contrast of things as they are, with things as they might be, has not



entered like a sword into her side. So her preaching is no longer a militant and prophetic ultimatum, but the conciliatory and soothing sedative of one that hath a pleasant voice and plays well upon an instrument. The witness of the Church is directed not to the need of a radical improvement in the machinery of society, but simply to the virtue of providing more oil for the rough and grinding parts.

So it is that the Church fails to represent the ideals or utter the demands and aspirations of this new democracy of awakened men, and, let me add, awakened women. Friction there must indeed ever be on this mortal sphere, and the milder and sweeter graces will never become obsolete. But there need never be so much pain and cruelty of friction as this. To sensitive ears the blood of our slain brethren crieth from the ground; and the burden of its testimony is that this futility and waste can be stopped, that the social order can be improved, that there is something more urgent than theology that needs readjustment and reconstruction—that life itself is being balked of producing its finest results.

These practical idealists require of the churches *not* that they shall be mere oil-cans to supply the unction of "charity," but that they shall breed and train the designers, the fitters, and the engineers of social justice. They must do more than teach us meekly to endure as an ordained fate things as they are, they must generate the enthusiasm for social reform; they must not only proffer palliatives and ghostly comforts, they must indicate some clear practical methods of social redemption, and outline on earth the plan of that Ideal City whose builder and architect is God.

Modernism is sensitive to the urgency of all this. The vibration of the democratic note is felt all through the movement. The breath of this more than human inspiration has blown even through secluded cloisters. Nuns in remote convents have sent tokens of greeting to assemblies celebrating the life and work of Savonarola. Priests who once served God's altar through tears are now serving Him as members of the Italian Parliament. Monks in their cells pray for the ending of the long night's vigil and for the breaking of a new day.

Here, then, we find another aspect of the wider meaning of Modernism. Do we not already hear two clear voices calling to the Church of Christ? One is the voice of the religious reformer asking for more liberty of thought, for leave to range the realms of science, for the emancipation of his intellectual manhood and for the priceless gift of truth. The other is the voice of the social reformer—we might even say the social mystic—asking for more freedom of life, for economic opportunity, for the gift of justice, for emotional union with his brethren, for a deeper morality and a more alluring romance of faith, and, strange as it may appear, for the vision of a progress and the conviction of an immortal hope that can overstep the grave. And both these petitions come before that organ which claims to be the Living Body of Him who is the Master of all who love.

Let me give first a sample of the words

of the social reformer by quoting from a speech of Jaures', the leader of the Socialists, delivered before the French Chamber in 1906 during the church crisis in France. Turning to the Catholics, he said:—"Why do you not seize the incomparable occasion afforded you by the Law of Separation for dissociating yourselves from the political and social powers of the past, for renewing your contact with the two great forces of the modern world, science and democracy? . . . To the proletariat, to the workers, you, the Church, could have said, 'On the very morrow of the social revolution, even if it realises all your dreams of justice, nay, especially if it realises it, I shall await you. For you will prove the narrowness of human life with the more certainty that you will have exhausted all its possibilities. Yes, sons of the people, act, toil, prepare the future. Still, on the morrow I, the Church, await you. In the communism that goes farthest and deepest there will still subsist the narrowness of egoism, the sombre impenetrability of the closed soul. I, the Church, will set before you, not co-operation, not harmony, but the ardent fusion of hearts in the life-centre of an incomparable Personality. In spite of all, there remains one great individualist, Death, who settles the accounts of all, but who settles accounts with each, and who shatters all social and human solidarities on the hard edge of the tomb. Well, beyond this crisis, beyond this shadow, I, the Church, have caught a glimpse for you. I have announced for you a sublime reconstitution of human solidarities in the ample bosom of a renovated world. . . . I bring you a promise of life which the revolutionaries of thought and action have never equalled. So act, advance, urge your claims; I will not strike with the rods of a maddening absolutism the vast democracies moving like the sea; I will not lay the weight of a stagnant immobility on this ocean stirred by the wind which comes in from the deep . . . but on the tops of all the swelling waves I will place the light of a superhuman hope.' That is what you, the Church, might have said to men if you had still faith in your own principles."

And, finally, listen to a sample of the words of the great English Modernist, Father Tyrrell:—"Can it be that the Church, which so many legions of martyrs, saints, thinkers and scholars have enriched with their very best, with their heart's blood and their spirit's anguish, is to fall the prey of a selfish and godless bureaucracy? . . . Shall the once thronged city be deserted and the Queen of the Nations be made a widow, and the streets of Zion mourn because there are none to come to her solemnities, because her gates are thrown down and her priests in tears and her virgins in rags, and she herself oppressed with bitterness. Shall her gold be tarnished and her fine colours faded, and the stones of her sanctuary lie heaped at the street corners, and all this because she has let her sucklings perish for thirst, and refused the bread of life to her little ones—to the starving millions of our modern civilisation who wander harassed and worried as sheep having no shepherd, or because for the scarlet rags of a secular splendour departed long since and for

ever she has forgotten her true glory, and has walled herself round with stone and iron and narrowed the borders of her tent, and from a world-embracing religion as wide as the heart of Christ, has shrivelled herself up to a waspish sect glorying as none other in her rigidity and exclusiveness?"

"Is this what Catholicism has come to—so grand a name for so mean a thing? Is this the religion of all humanity and of the whole man, of the classes and the masses, of the Greek and the barbarian, of the University and the slum, neither above the lowest intelligence nor beneath the highest; neither a burden to the weak nor an offence to the strong . . . All this we had a right to look for in the Church of Rome, the nursing mother of European civilisation. And what do we find? Are her breasts dry? Are her hands empty? Can she do nothing for us—nothing at all?"

It is words like these that have made me a Free Catholic, that keep me still under the dominion of a dream that dreams with ever brightening hope that some group of churches—ours I pray—may launch forth on the flow of this tidal opportunity in the affairs of men. Now is the hour of our summons, the psychological moment for a church fearless in its social witness, tough as tempered steel in the structure of its will, lucid and open as the day in its intellectual outlook, but at the same time a church lovely with the colours of imaginative art, musical with poetic song, and richly deep in the quality of its mystical emotion. Cannot we be pioneers in giving expression to those wider and profounder meanings of Modernism? If not we, then, in all this wide world, who? Oh, yes, we *can* do it if we *will*; if we but dare sail forth on the enterprise and not leave this gallant ship of our adventure becalmed or barnacled at its moorings. It needs faith, it needs courage, it needs magnanimity and rare love—but all these by God's great grace may be ours. A huge church may tell of a meanness that is sinister and of a pettiness that is contemptible. A small church, small as that of the upper room in Jerusalem, may be vast in the vision of its purpose and magnificent in the grandeur of its design. Shelley, after seeing St. Peter's in Rome, wrote to a friend: "It exhibits littleness on a large scale." May not we, comrades of the Free Catholic faith, work for a day when another poet, having seen the tiniest of our wayside chapels, shall write words not wholly unmerited: "On a small scale it exhibits greatness." Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

## THE WIDER MEANING OF MODERNISM.

### II.

BY THE REV. J. WORSLEY AUSTIN, M.A.

THE movement in the Roman Catholic Church that goes by the name of Modernism is one which, as the title of my paper indicates, has a narrower and a wider meaning. Viewed from one point, it is but another domestic trouble in the ancient Church of Christendom. Viewed from another it is seen to involve issues



of vital interest to all churches, to our own in particular. We shall be wise in being somewhat reserved in prophesying to what goal it is moving. Liberal theologians have always had the bad habit of making wholesale deductions from any signs of liberalising tendency in other churches. "The world is coming our way at last," we exclaim when we see a little stir here or there. But it is always only a tiny bit of the world, and that bit often has a trying way of sheering off in some other direction just as we are preparing to open our arms and fall on its neck. So with Modernism. It is representative of only a tiny world in the Roman Catholic world, so far. It has begun to tread a thorny pathway, it is struggling with enormous problems, it is in most things very tentative, and its real direction is very hard to determine.

In Modernism we admittedly have some of the early results of the influence of modern knowledge and theory on Roman Catholic conceptions. Father Tyrrell, in an article in the *Hibbert Journal* a year ago, disclosed in vigorous fashion the extraordinary precaution that is taken to exclude the light of modern thought from Roman Catholic seminaries. But that light does gain entrance, and where it falls a new situation is created. The underlying principles, claims and beliefs of Catholicism are seen to need a new interpretation if they are to be harmonised with the modern spirit. This work the modernist has undertaken. It is a task that takes him to the very roots of Christianity, nay, to some of the fundamental problems of all religion. And it is this that gives the wider significance to that task, and makes the effort of supreme importance to non-Catholics.

First and foremost there is the great modern doctrine of development, which has been described by the late Principal Caird as furnishing "the guiding principle of science." This lies at the foundation of all modern thought and knowledge; and it is imperative that Catholic theory must be brought into harmony with this, or its hold on the modern mind must pass away.

Now this was perceived long before the day of Loisy and Tyrrell. John Henry Newman perceived it, and as early as 1845 made the attempt to harmonise the claims of an infallible authority and an infallible revelation with the idea of religious development. He produced a working theory, and one, as far as it went, ingenious and serviceable. In so far as he perceived the great problem that was opening up and tried to meet it, Newman was in a certain true sense the Father of Modernism.

But since his day a multitude of fresh considerations have come into the foreground affecting every idea with which Newman dealt. The modern critical spirit has undermined the very fundamentals of Catholicism—the idea of authority itself, the idea of revelation, the notion of infallibility as attached to a man, a dogma, or an institution. On all these and similar points the modernist perceives there can be no question of reconciliation with the modern spirit. As they stand these ideas cannot be harmonised with the principle of development. The question is a question of reading a new meaning

into them; a meaning which shall stand securely in the midst of all the upheaval of thought, all the growing knowledge, all the critical inquiry of the present day.

Modernism thus is not a movement of theological reconstruction. The modernists have not yet got to doctrinal revision. They are engaged on graver work still. They are engaged on the reconstruction of first principles, the principles which underlie all theological discussion, all church life, all religious movement whatsoever. And for us in particular this very work should be of enormous interest, for it is at any rate of enormous significance. They are doing the work for Liberalism—for us as much as for anyone. They are thrashing out the really vital questions which we are gradually coming to see are our questions in building a Liberal Church, and which we have treated hitherto as negligible quantities or in a superficial fashion.

Take the supreme question of the co-ordinating in church life of individualism with collectivism, of personal liberty with the authority that belongs not to the personal but the general will, of the individual vision of truth with the affirmations of the larger religious consciousness. Each has its claims and in every form of church life and church government they are in some way adjusted. In our own body they are adjusted in rough and ready manner, with the largest possible respect to the individual and his individual values, the least possible respect to the common life, its claims and values. The Modernist, nourished in a church in which the adjustment is thought out, reasoned, formulated, is seeking a readjustment that shall be also reasoned and formulated. This at once brings into consideration the whole question as to what a church is, what its nature is, what is the basis on which it rests. Let us glance at this.

(1) *The Church Idea.*—The Modernist clings tenaciously to the idea on which he has been nourished from infancy, the idea of a Church of God, the guardian of Truth, the supporter of virtue, the highest embodiment of man's religious consciousness. But he believes no longer in a supernaturalistic authoritative basis for such. Abandoning that position he has reached the ground that the church is a natural and a democratic institution. Father Tyrrell writes: "We may hope to return to the profoundly Christian and Catholic conception of the democratic character of all authority, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." That is a good general base from which to begin the task of reconstruction. But it marks the beginning of extraordinary difficulties, theoretical and practical, some of which we, as a denomination, are acutely feeling to-day, and let us hope shall find a way of surmounting.

We want that notion of a democratic church thrashed out thoroughly. It is the basis of Nonconformist Church life, and this links the Nonconformist to the Modernist. But the Nonconformist has few clear ideas about the nature of democratic authority as applied to church life. The very word authority suggests hierarchies and inquisitions. You cannot please a Nonconformist audience better

than by inveighing against ecclesiastical authority. That is the Nonconformist's great delusion, that it does not exist in his Church. But it does exist in his Church. It exists in our churches. If you doubt it, try and do something in your church in opposition to your vestry committee. You submit to the recognised authority in everything in which you conform to the recognised law and order of your church life. If, as Dr. Eliot has told us, the highest liberty is law, it is also true that there is no law without authority.

In our individual churches we have really solved the difficulty of adjusting individual liberty to ecclesiastical law, and we have learnt that there is no fear in authority as long as it is democratic. Can we trust in that in the wider sphere of united church life and action? Here is our great problem. And if you look at the matter rightly you will see that until that problem is settled and our churches have combined as such to form an administrative agency, on a democratic basis, true union in action and responsibility is impossible.

Now it is when it dawns on you that the liberal faith is at the opening of this most difficult and thorny path, which it may be forced to tread by the very exigencies of its own existence, that the writings of the Modernists, who have come to the same point from a very different region, become instructive and important. This will become clearer as we proceed. Let us go on to the question of Doctrine.

(2) *The Church and Doctrine.*—A church, be it democratic or otherwise, must teach. It must stand for some truth, or truths. It must have doctrine.

The Modernists, as I have said, are not yet attempting to reconstruct particular doctrines, but to re-state underlying principles. The Roman Church proceeds on the principle that its official voice, expressed in Council or Pope, is the voice of God, and infallible, and to their decisions you must go for the truths that the Church upholds.

But in a truly democratic church, whither must you go? Here is the question the Modernist is trying to answer, and again it comes home to us most closely.

We of the Free Churches may be divided into two groups on the point. There are (a) those who hold that in such churches there can be no doctrine put forward as Church doctrine, that the teaching function of the church is carried out by the minister preaching his individual views, and the congregation being simply in some sort of undefined general agreement with him and with one another; (b) those who hold that there is a consensus of opinion in essential points, and that this can be expressed, not as the minister's private opinion merely, but as the definite teaching of the Church at a given time. But we have not got that fundamental problem clearly settled as to what is the true working relationship between a free democratic church and its doctrine.

Now the Modernists are facing that identical problem, and they know it to be vital; and I admire the way Father Tyrrell tries to find the solution, though I do not think he has succeeded.

He proceeds by making a hard and



fast distinction between what he calls "Revelation" and "Theology." Revelation belongs to the realm of immediate experience, and supplies the subject-matter with which Theology deals. Theology is the product of reflection on experience. A revealed Theology is an impossibility. And so there is no finality in any theological statement, neither the earliest nor the latest. All doctrine is fallible, and in the decisions of councils and the pronouncements of Popes there is no necessarily absolute expression of truth. There is a developing theology framed by the Church in the interests of what alone is authoritative and final, viz., the religious experience which the Church carries in its corporate mind and which it transmits from age to age. The whole argument here runs to a conclusion which I admit is not definitely stated, and which is that a church can teach no doctrine as absolute once it has given up its supernatural claim. All doctrine really becomes a tentative matter, an attempt to express the Truth under the given conditions of thought, and all Church teaching must be regarded as secondary to the cultivation of moral and religious experience. This brings him close to our own position. But there would still be this difference. Theological pronouncement he would still take to be a part of the function of a church, and would look in a democratic institution to the decisions of experts, to what he speaks of as a consensus *Fidelium*, which I suppose would mean practically a church council formed from the official teaching class. You would get thus not an absolute theology, but the best and truest theology possible at a given time, something better and truer than the individual by himself could evolve. A creed thus formed by the theologians and open to continual reformulation seems to be the Modernist ideal, and to carry the highest kind of authority there can be in such matters.

If I interpret rightly here, the Modernist has not yet got clear of the dogmatic view of religion. But he sets us thinking again about a problem that is ours as much as his.

Let us now glance at our own situation. We have no definite acknowledged means of giving expression in this to the corporate mind of the Church. You become aware of this at once when some earnest inquirer asks you what doctrine, *i.e.*, teaching, your Church stands for. It comes upon you that your Church as such has no recognised organ of speech. Consequently, either you tell him of a book that some individual has written which seems to you a fair summary of "our" views, or you sum them up for him yourself, or you back out of the position by asserting that the Church is free to all truth-seekers, and implying that as such it stands in the world for no particular truth. The principles involved here are at the bottom of some of our own domestic disagreements, which shall be nameless. There is a knotty problem here which I have never yet found anyone to solve for me. I thought Mr. Lloyd Thomas was going to when I read his book on a Free Catholic Church. He solved the question of Church *dogma* easily enough. But the trouble comes in again with the question of Church *doctrine*. Can a Free Church

stand for any doctrine? If I interpret Mr. Lloyd Thomas rightly, he holds that it can and should. Then I want to know by what means we can get the utterance of a Free Church on a point of doctrine. Could we here to-day as a representative body, decide any point of Church teaching, and give the decision forth as a doctrinal utterance of the Church? Can we conceive of any means by which this could be done satisfactorily? Would we let a body of our theological experts do it? Well, if a Church, as such, can find no means of speech, then it can have no doctrine and cannot be truly said to stand for any particular truth or truths in the world. I know, as I have said, that there are those amongst us who have felt this *impasse*, and are content that the Church should be not merely undogmatic but also non-doctrinal, which means pure individualism in all theological teaching. And those of us who are not content with pure individualism in anything, and believe that in a Free Church a consensus of conviction is gradually formed which has its worth and authority side by side with individual opinion, can point to no agency that has any authority to say at any time what that consensus is. This means that any one of us has as much right as another to act as interpreter of the Church's consciousness, to say if it have distinctive truths to communicate, and, if so, what they are. I am not concerned now to try to answer any of these difficult questions. I wish simply to draw attention to the fact that there are many such difficult questions for which we have no true and universally accepted answers, and that on these points the Modernist is unearthing our difficulties and doing much hard thinking for us.

(3) *The Church and Christianity*.—Another instructive matter is to be found in the Modernist's attitude towards historical Christianity. In this you find a blend of extraordinary breadth with extraordinary narrowness of view. The Modernist is a student of comparative religion, and already is recognising that the unique and supernatural character of Christianity is undermined. He has advanced to the view that religion everywhere is the outcome of the same spirit, and that Christianity simply exhibits the working of the religious spirit at its highest. So Father Tyrrell writes:—

"It is undeniable that in its generic aspect as a religion, one of the great religions, Catholicism, is older than Christ, as old as humanity itself, as old as speech or language. Religions themselves are but the languages in which man holds converse with God. And these languages are of one family and one origin, human and divine; the work of God through man, and of man under God."

There could be no stronger endorsement of the modern liberal view. Christianity is simply at the apex, as the greatest natural revelation or experience of God in human life. The view leads directly to the thought of a progressive Christianity, a continuous unfolding and development of religious experience as the principle of a progressive church. It is surely of enormous significance to find Catholics, trained in all the old traditions of their

Church, pointing, as all others do who have felt the pressure of modern ideas, in this direction.

But the Modernist has not yet fully thought himself clear of his traditions and their implications. And so you still find the plea for a normative or classical period of Christian revelation which was closed with the last apostle. The Modernist still makes the Past a fetter, and sees nothing higher in Christian endeavour than the ability to enter and interpret the experience of the apostolic champions of the Faith.

Here is where he has something to learn from us. We have found how the Past may be our guide without being our fetter, and know that the supreme fact in religion must always be a present reality. We might like to explore, say, Peter's mind, and no doubt we should mostly be better men if some of our experiences corresponded more nearly with his. But the grand aim of life is not this impossible task; and Christianity does not consist in our carrying it out.

Christianity is a perennial force, an impulse, an inspiration. And its chief value lies in the fact, not that it makes us think anyone else's thoughts or reproduce his feelings; but that it makes us think our own thoughts, awakens our own best feelings, and makes us recipients in higher and larger measure of the immediate revelation of God to the soul. And that should surely be the supreme aim of the Christian Church.

In dealing with the question of the relationship of the present to the past, there is another point at which the Modernist for the moment fails, and in failing is as instructive as if he succeeded. This is when he deals with the problem of religious continuity. The Modernist has a veritable passion for continuity in religion; this is what keeps him so steadfastly within the Catholic fold. But he sees truly in recognising that a Church, in so far as it seeks to break with the religious life of the past and establish itself as something outside and distinct, is doomed to weakness and decay. In so far as its ideal is to make itself the inheritor of all that the ages can give it, in so far as it takes its stand in the line of the spiritual development of humanity, it must live. But the Modernist falls into the old error of supposing that any given movement of the human spirit is bound up with the organism or institution in and through which it manifests itself. To preserve the continuity of the movement you must therefore seek ever to preserve the institution. He assumes that the original institution always occupies the position where all the vital impulses of the past are gathered together and transmitted to the future. So he clings to the Roman Catholic Church and condemns schism utterly. Schism with him means separation from the institution, and that means separation from the developing life of the past. But we have learnt a greater truth, and the Modernist, as he reads history more deeply, will learn it too. And this is that bodily forms are always outgrown at last and cast aside, as the life develops. Nations themselves rise and pass away. Institutions flourish and are no more. Creeds come and go. Churches appear



and vanish. But there is one thing that outlasts them all, and that is the inner Life of Humanity, that uses them all as temporary vehicles so that each becomes at length a stepping stone to higher things.

Schism is an uninviting word. It does stand for error. Real schism is something spiritual—spiritual isolation. It is not cutting oneself away from any institution. It is isolating oneself from the life of the past. It is attempted detachment from the spiritual stream. It is barring up the doors and windows against the sun, and endeavouring to keep house in the light of one's own little candle or lamp. Moving into another house where the windows are larger and the doors more easily opened is not schism.

We need to grasp that, and to bring it into connection with our own thought of our own Church. Never admit that you are a schismatic. Never think of your Church's life as something detached and isolated from the stream of man's religious life—a merely present-day affair. Our movement, if it is worth anything, is a movement not to destroy, but to preserve continuity. And our Church is not what it should be to us until we think of it in a larger way than we can think of any other, the spiritual inheritor of all that is good and true in the life of the world, through which we claim as ours every sincere thinker and every aspiring soul the world has known.

As we realise this when we meet in our little sanctuary we gain the mightiest incentive there is for the soul. The material walls of our tabernacle vanish. Though sitting apart we are surrounded by the great cloud of witnesses. We know ourselves to be in the one great communion of true worshippers, and realise what it is to be, not a member of a little human group merely, but "fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God."

**NOTE.**—In last week's report of the National Conference Guilds' Union and Union for Social Service Meetings there is a dislocation which will have been at once apparent to the Higher Critics among our readers. The report of the Guild's Union meeting ends abruptly, and without the second of the two addresses referred to at the end of Mr. Anderton's speech. This, however, will be found at the end of the Social Service Union report on the next page—the address of Dr. Eliot, with its opening reference to the American Young People's Religious Union.

Now here is the problem of religious organisation at the present day. We ask ourselves: What do men wish to do with religion? We must have first of all that clear, distinct aim; and I think we are coming to see that it is something more than the salvation of an individual soul—it is the salvation of human society. That is the declared end, let us say, of every Church, of every minister of religion, of every believer. Let us get that clear before us, the cleansing of society from its sin, building it up in strength, bringing in hope and love, and possibility of worship to each son of man here upon the earth. That ideal is coming.—*S. M. Crothers.*

## THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE.

### THE PUBLIC MEETING.

THE Town Hall was completely filled on Thursday evening, April 22, at the public meeting, over which Mr. T. H. Winder, of Bolton, presided. It was estimated that some 1,600 people were present. An organ recital by Mr. J. T. Fliteroft, organist at Bank-street Chapel, preceded the meeting, which opened with the singing of the hymn, "Come, kingdom of our God." It was a splendid gathering, marked by a most refreshing enthusiasm, and the speeches, various as they were in tone and character, were of a high order of eloquent appeal.

The CHAIRMAN, in his opening address, said that as the first Bolton man who had had a look-in at the Conference so far, he expressed a hearty welcome to all who had attended it. It had been a very great delight, he said, to have had the Conference in Bolton. The town was not exactly a garden-city, but beneath the canopy of smoke there were as many kind hearts, as public spirited men, and, he hoped and believed, as hospitable homes as could be found in any town in England. That had been a memorable Conference. They had heard thoughts expressed which he thought ought not to be allowed to remain in the pages of a newspaper. He hoped some means would be found of making a permanent record of what they had heard in that hall and elsewhere—they were far too precious to die. Human life was a serious, sacred, and responsible thing. A great many people went through it as if the world was merely a playground. It was not a playground. If it were anything at all it was a preparation of the human soul for eternity. There was work to be done, and he felt that Bolton—the town in which he was bred and born—had reason to be proud of the social work that was carried on in its midst. Without going into detail, he might mention that they had infirmaries, hospitals, convalescent homes, nursing institutions, clubs, and a host of other minor institutions, and, last but not least, a Guild of Help which divided the town into twenty districts, and there were 400 willing helpers who were doing their very best to reach out to the struggling and suffering humanity in the town. He called that practical Christianity. That was their garden; fragrant with the wealth of men and women who were doing their best to alleviate the suffering of their neighbours.

### THE CONFERENCE—DENOMINATIONAL AND CATHOLIC.

The Rev. JOSEPH WOOD prefaced his remarks with an acknowledgment of the gracious kindness and the unbounded hospitality of the Bolton people. The National Conference came to Bolton in full expectation of a warm reception. They knew a good many of the people at Bolton—they knew their honoured minister, Mr. Weatherall, and they were quite sure they would be received with the

heartiest of welcomes, but the welcome had exceeded their expectations. He did not remember any Conference in any town where they had been received with so much hearty kindness and generosity. Proceeding to answer the question, Who and what they were who called themselves a National Conference, he said they had come from all quarters of the land. Who were they that met? Whom did they represent? What were their aims? What was their bond of union? They had a voluminous list of names, and they were sometimes chaffed about their heterogeneous titles. He rejoiced in the variety of opinions they represented. The titles might be regarded somewhat as the Americans regarded the stars in their national flag, which represented each a different State, yet bound together in a living unity. He was willing to add to the number of those stars. Let them all come—the Modernists, New Theologians, Free Catholics, Universalists. The doors were wide open: "Whosoever will, let him come." Whatever the names of their various churches might be, most of them as individuals called themselves Unitarian, and they were not ashamed of it. Therein was a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. The immense prejudice against the name would be amusing if it were not so astounding. No doubt originally it arose from bigotry, but in these days it very likely arose from sheer ignorance. Beneath these various names there was very real and substantial unity. They were one people, and when they met together in gatherings like that they were controlled by a common sympathy by which they knew they were one. What was the essence of their unity? What was it that made them one people? It was not that they had subscribed to any one creed or to any three creeds. It was not that they had agreed on a certain set of theological statements; still less did they conform to any one mode of worship. None of these things could really secure unity. There might be, and often, alas! there was division and a spirit of antagonism among people who used the same Prayer Book and confessed the same creeds. Their unity was not of these things. It might be summed up in four significant words—freedom, veracity, spirituality, and progress. What did they mean by freedom? They meant, first of all, liberty of prophesying and the unfettered search for truth, unfettered and unafraid. What did they mean by right of private judgment? They meant the absence of any attempt to control the opinions either of ministers or of congregations; they meant the rejection of all authority except the authority of truth, right reasoning, and conscience taught by experience. That was fundamental with them, and was the corner stone of their unity. Then they were on the demand for the utmost veracity no paltering with words and formulæ, no keeping back a part for the sake of prudence; no use of ancient and popular terminology, which meant one thing to the preacher and another to the common ear. They meant by veracity the resolve to be simply faithful to the thing as they saw it, and to be loyal to the truth,



as they apprehended it. It was a hard and rocky road, that of veracity. It meant that many of them had to make sacrifices, in some cases of friends, in other cases the renouncing of hallowed practices associated with childhood. He thanked God that there were so many brave souls who had made this high adventure in the cause of truth, who had not shrunk from the sacrifices demanded by the utmost veracity. Spirituality was another note of their unity. He did not mean that they were more spiritually minded than other churches. God forbid any such arrogance. They were concerned not so much with the form of the law as with the meaning of the spirit, not so much with dogmatic religion as with the ethics of religion; not so much about the definitions of ritual, but about the right disposition of heart and mind. To magnify the notion of ritual and of definition had, as they knew, been the curse of Christendom through all the centuries. Could they pronounce the right shibboleth? Even that was not enough. Could they pronounce the right shibboleth with the right accent? They rejoiced that they had been enabled to cast off the burden which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. How gladly they walked in the spirit. This was the essence of their unity, not theological opinion. That was no slight on theological science. Theology was not religion, any more than astronomy was the same thing as the stars in heaven, or botany the same thing as the flowers in the field; and in insisting on religion as first apart from all considerations of forms and ceremonies and creeds, they were insisting on a spiritual bond of union. Then came the last secret of their unity—that mighty word progress which they inscribed on all their banners. What a multitude of causes ranged themselves round that word! It was one of the most popular watchwords of their time. Every party in the State, every movement of social reform and science commended itself to the public as progressive, and yet in religion and in religious thought men seemed to think that no progress was possible. They talked of the faith that was once delivered to the Saints, and they said that that faith admitted of no change. That was not the mark of their churches. Those who contended for the progressive nature of Christianity maintained there was no finality in revelation. They did not say simply, "God spake these words and said." They said, "God speaks to-day in the reign of King Edward, even as He did in the reign of King David." Truth was dynamic, not static. Religion was dynamic, and meant growth. On these four things they founded their unity, their oneness, their binding fellowship, and this made them at once denominational and catholic. To be denominational was not to be sectarian. Sectarianism refused fellowship to others—they refused fellowship to no one. As they were bound together by the principles of freedom, veracity, spirituality, and progress, they were not only denominational but they were catholic, with a catholicity wide as the heavens of God, wide as God Himself. They had no boundary walls to their churches.

#### THE BIBLE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

The Rev. Dr. CARPENTER said that about two months ago a remarkable meeting was held at Oxford, though it did not attract the attention it deserved. There were present many distinguished clergymen, scholars of every rank and degree, and of almost every department of knowledge, and they met to hear discourses from some of the most distinguished scientific men in commemoration of the one-hundredth birthday of Charles Darwin. That was in a small way a measure of the effect of modern knowledge on the study of the Bible. It was just fifty years, he believed, since the "Origin of Species" was published. Jowett was then preparing the memorable essay, published the year after, in which he laid it down that the Bible was to be interpreted like any other book, and in those few words withdrew the Scriptures from the control of the church. Colenso was beginning those studies with his Zulu pupils which were to shake to the foundations the old views on the inspiration of the Bible. The first thing they learned, when the new studies of the brave and patient scholar made their way into this country, was that Oriental books were not written after the fashion of a modern English history or treatise on philosophy. They learned that such books were made up of all kinds of materials; some founded on ancient tradition, some little bits of codes of law, some fragments of poetry; some narratives which were put together and added to, age after age, and century after century, till they finally assumed their present form; and that process, once begun in the investigation of the Old Testament, was carried on into the New, with the result there, too, we learned that gospel and revelation—aye, and even some Apostolic and other letters—also had finally come into their present form by processes very similar to those he had described. They might take one of the products of modern Oxford scholarship—a commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew by a very able scholar, Mr. Willoughby Allen—and they would find that he went through the Gospel verse by verse, noting this was taken from St. Mark, and that from an earlier collection of sayings this from a collection of prophecies and explanations, and that from a special Palestinian source; where this came from we do not know, and that is a bit of the editor's handiwork. Under the investigations of the time the result had been to drive entirely off the field the ancient doctrine of verbal inspiration. But there was much more than that. When about 1874 a scholar in the British Museum published in the pages of the *Daily Telegraph* the first translation of the Chaldean account of the Flood, it became at once apparent that the stories of the first ages of mankind, occupying the first eleven pages of the Book of Genesis, largely owed their form to sources incalculably older than Moses, or even—he was going to say—than Noah, and which were derived from the ancient culture of Babylonia. They were in the book which is still popularly called the "Word of God," and which had been discussed from that point of view by

one of the distinguished members of that constituency—Mr. George Harwood. This ancient literature reflected the ideas, and conveyed to a certain extent the morals, of a very early form of civilisation indeed. The process which began with the Old Testament, and which was freely recognised in every theological college in the land, as applied to the Old Testament, was also being applied more slowly to the New, for there had come to light during the last two or three decades a vast amount of material which enabled them first of all to reconstruct the view of the world as it appeared to Jesus and his disciples, and to Paul and the other disciples of the early Christian church. They knew of the vast hierarchies of beings that filled the spaces between the earth and the topmost of the seven heavens that rose above it, and they knew also how Judaism had been slowly absorbing many of the great ideas of the religions round about. It was the conjecture a few years ago of that bold pioneer in Biblical study, Canon Cheney, founded on the study of the mythologies of these Oriental cults, that the Apostle Paul must have been acquainted with a spiritual biography of the Messiah, of his heavenly existence, his descent to earth and to the lower regions, and his return to heavenly glory, which could be fitted to the person of Jesus of Nazareth as soon as he had become convinced that he was Christ or Messiah. It was no longer possible for scholars to ignore those vast masses of material, derived from ancient inscriptions, from papyri, from the books of the great eschatological hope—the hope of the last things current in Judaism—and, further, from a much wider sphere of facts brought to light under the name of the science of man, or anthropology, and from the study of religion in the various forms in which it presented itself, from the lower culture to the loftiest spiritual emotion. All this new knowledge was pouring in upon them like a flood, and it was bound to have a profound influence upon the religious conception of the future. The whole of their conceptions of primitive Christianity, and its early development, had to be reshaped in its light, and this would be the task of the next generation of scholarship, to which must be added the wider outlook over the great history of the religions of the East, which showed them, in the case of Buddhism, so remarkable a line of development, almost parallel with that of Christianity itself, resulting in the production of what might be called a Buddha-consciousness within the fold of the disciples of Buddha, parallel with that of the Christians in the Christian Church. No student of the Bible in future could fail to take account of those facts. He did not say that they made the Bible a book that was easy to study. It required for its full appreciation a vigorous exercise of historical imagination, but there was another side to all that. There was another light let in by all this study on the original aims and conceptions of Jesus himself, and his personality. Though they might not be able to reconstruct all the outlines of his life, to tell in what year he was born, or in what year he died, nevertheless those aims and conceptions stood out with a



clearness, a power, which enabled them to understand how he should have been the creator of the Christian character, the inspirer of Christian ethics, the great force and impulse which had sent the church forward through all the ages. They had discovered that the New Testament was in reality a book of revelation. Much of the great movement of social reform, which was foremost in our midst to-day was due to the return of theology, of religious study in this country to the thought and the work of Jesus of Nazareth. A bold saying of one of the greatest bishops who ever sat upon the English Bench, himself a profound student of the New Testament, the late Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott), was that the great cry of the Revolution, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" expressed the fundamental conception of Christianity. It was to that work also they had to devote themselves in endeavouring to bring the light of historical knowledge on to the Bible. They must turn to that Book once more, not merely for the sake of reconstructing a venerable past, but as the great Book of religious experience. They must go to it for strength in their moments of temptation, for comfort in the hours of sorrow which befel them all; and go to it as a Book of hope when the spirit languished and comfort died, and they would find that they would read it with a new force, with a higher meaning, for it would carry with it the experience of all those whom it had sustained in the endeavour after the Christian life, and having once got that meaning from it, it could never fail.

#### CHURCH AND STATE.

Mr. RICHARD D. HOLT, M.P., said if he had to give the few remarks he proposed to make a title it would be "Church and State." When he used the word Church he meant any organised body of Christian workers, whether a gigantic denomination or a single congregation, and he was not referring in any sense to one particular denomination or one set of churches more than another. He thought they would all agree that they did not intend to allow the State to interfere with their church, and disapproved of it having any interference in the churches of others, and it was not, therefore, worth while referring to that aspect of the question. The object of a church, as he understood it, was primarily worship of God, and, secondly, the development of Christian character amongst the congregations, that they might learn to live the full and complete Christian life in accordance with the will of God. The conditions of the State in which they lived was that the government was entirely in the hands of the people, and it was recognised on all hands that the prime duty of the Government was to attend to the welfare of the individual citizens, and generally to make it easier for them to be better men. It would at once be seen that there was a sort of similarity between the influence of a Church and a State, and that there was indeed a great deal of overlapping as to the object they wished to attain, and possibly as to the work they were actually going to do. He would suggest first that it was not the duty of

a church as an organised body to take any part whatever in political work. There was nothing, he thought, that most of them would deprecate more than the use of the pulpit for political propaganda. He thought, too, that most of them would regret to find their church assemblies, of whatever sort they might be, utilised for the same purpose. He was quite aware that there were a great many political questions, such as the education question and temperance, which appealed so vitally to many members of their congregations, almost in their religious aspect, that it was impossible for them to resist the opportunity of bringing them in on those occasions, but he would respectfully submit that after all there were or might be—he hoped there were—in every church large numbers of people who differed very materially in their political opinions, and they, of all people, were anxious that their church should be as truly catholic in respect to the political opinions of people as it could be in respect to their religious opinions. He would suggest—and it was a suggestion which he thought might be fairly made to all religious bodies—that there was something of a danger that whilst they were getting more slack with regard to the enforcement of any standard of theological conformity they might be seeking to establish some standard of political conformity in their membership. That, he thought, would be greatly to be deplored. He did not mean that anyone would try in terms to set up a political orthodoxy, but it was easy to imagine circumstances in which the general action of the congregation on political matters made it distasteful and unpleasant for people who differed to remain connected with a congregation. That was a regrettable thing, and they should be careful not to give just cause to those who differed to find themselves uncomfortable and not thoroughly at home in the work of the church. Might he suggest another argument turning rather on political expediency? It was that very often they would find that if one church took up very ardently and enthusiastically any particular political cause it seemed that natural obstinacy of the human race was apt to induce another church to take up the opposite side with the same enthusiasm. Turning from speaking of what a church should not do to what he thought a church should do, he said it was a distinct part of the business of a church to impress upon its individual members the fact that they had a personal duty to perform in regard to the governing of the State. He did not think their church had been unduly slack in this matter, but there was always the danger that if they prided themselves particularly on their record in the past, their future record was not likely to show much improvement, and might even become a record of backsliding rather than of progress. They all recognised that the State could be a vast engine for good if properly worked, but it was obviously vital to our system of government that there should be no shortage of good men to carry on the work. The whole success of the system adopted in every democratic country depended on their being able to get thoroughly first-class men to perform the duties of citizen-

ship. To impress on the members of their congregations that they had a bounden duty of personal service to perform to the State was the essential duty of the church; not that their duty lay in holding particular views or opinions, but in having reasonable independent views on all matters of political moment. Everyone could do that, whether rich or poor. Many had the time and leisure to give service in different public positions, and he was sure in Bolton there could not be any slackness on the part of individuals in coming forward to fulfil those duties. Looking round amongst the congregations, however, he sometimes felt that there was not the same kind of endeavour for the public welfare and the same anxiety to give personal service for it as there was in the days of their fathers and grandfathers. All could do one thing, and that was to vote at every election. No one could tell the difference it would make to the class of men they would get to come forward as candidates if they knew that they would get from those who agreed with them an eager and ready support, and would not have to go about the district whipping-up reluctant and half-hearted people to put them in. He knew that the fact that it was necessary to go soliciting votes and assistance which ought to have been willingly forthcoming was one of the principal deterrents in making men fight shy of accepting public positions.

#### THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

The Rev. C. PEACH, who spoke on "The Education Question," said this was a subject of which they were heartily sick and tired, but however tired they might be of it they had not learned yet that weariness was a discharge from duty. They could speak freely on this question, because they had few vested interests at stake, save that of interest in the national welfare. It was not because they had not been conscious of their supreme obligation to the cause of education. It was one of their proudest memories that when the State had not been educated up to its duty that they in their schools on Sundays and week-days, without too nice a distinction between what was sacred and what was secular, used their opportunity to instruct the otherwise untaught masses. Now when the State had learned some measure of its duty they took up again their old unchanging interest in the question. Knowledge was in some directions still regarded with suspicion as something that was to be safe-guarded and carefully watched. They declared that they believed in education itself; they declared that education should not be merely the prerogative of the rich, nor, on the other hand, the servant of the sects; but education should be the great humanising instrument at the command of the State. They wanted to place education in its rightful position—as the first and supreme agency in the life of the nation. They regarded it as the emancipation of the heart and mind of the people, and they put their faith in education and not in Dreadnoughts for the protection and glory of their race. He wished to submit as a proposition that the test of their faith in their fellow men, in the order



of nature and in God, was their interest in education. He believed they were in absolute agreement that in its essence education should be a process of discovery and not a process of manufacture. He believed its purpose was to find out and to give expression to and opportunity to what was in men and women. The function of education was the discovery of what was in men, and thus to bring them to the place they should occupy—which was the only place that they could occupy, high or low, without any sense of shame—when they knew that the State would equally respect good work by men who were where God and Nature intended them to be, and where they were needed. He further submitted that education was fundamental to their principles of democracy. All their professions of democracy were absolutely worthless and meaningless unless they had some system by which they would give opportunity to every child to attain to the place for which he was fitted. It was one of the gravest scandals that the mere accident and the misfortunes of the parent should determine the place that a child must occupy. They knew in Lancashire that the mere accident where a child happened to be born, and who might be its parents, would determine, perhaps, whether he should go down the coal mine or to the cotton mill, there to blot out and keep silent genius and capacity, not only which were intended to shine, but for the want of which the nation itself might be languishing and must be the poorer. Those who really loved their country and were true patriots desired to bring to her service the very best which could be found. The patriotism they heard declaimed to-day meant the preservation of privilege for particular classes, whereas they, who loved their country so much, felt that the humblest place in it was good enough and sacred enough for the greatest of them. They realised how vital education was that nothing should stand in its way. As to the particular kind of education which might be given, using a phrase which he did not like, because it was so generally misunderstood, he said frankly that they stood practically unanimously for secular education. He wished to say at the same time that they denied emphatically the antithesis which seemed to be implied in the statement that they could draw a division between the sacred and the secular. They were not for secular education because they were tired of the question; they were not for it because they said they could not reconcile conflicting interests, but they were for it because it was the greatest of all expressions of faith in God and the order of His universe, because they believed that everything was sacred, that there was no province from which He was excluded, and that, sympathetically taught, they might draw the lesson of the divine order of Providence from every department of human culture and interest. Their desire was rather to rescue than to ban religion; to enlarge rather than narrow the scope and the opportunity of culture for the human spirit; and they recoiled from the artificial, unreal, narrow interpretation of religion which only recognised it when it was

dressed up in the artificial garb of a sect or a creed. There were many wrongs in the working of the education system still unredressed. They still suffered under the wrongs of Mr. Balfour's Act of 1902, which deprived them of the fundamental of self-government, the conduct of schools maintained out of public funds by the public. He expressed the hope that the Government, having, with a generosity that they did not learn from their opponents, offered all possible opportunities of compromise, would now realise that they could not compromise on questions of principle, and that in this question there was no possibility of compromise, but that the schools of the people must be free from bottom to top, must be managed by the people's representatives, and that those who had the honour to serve in them should have their appointments dependent on character and ability and not upon opinions.

#### THE PRESENT OPPORTUNITY OF OUR CHURCHES.

The Rev. MATTHEW R. SCOTT spoke as follows:—There never was a time when the opportunity of our churches was so great as it is to-day. I am quite well aware that we have all heard that before. There are grey heads in this audience that heard that 50 years ago, but between then and now there is a great difference. Whereas before it was prophecy, now it is fact. The time for which our fathers looked so eagerly is not now to come, it is here. The simpler and the deeper faith for which they prayed, wrought and made sacrifice is now proclaimed by voices and in places of which they never dreamt. Once, a few scholars wrote it silently in their studies; a liberal religious thinker here or there lifted up his solitary voice; but now in Nonconformity, in Anglicanism, in the very Church of Rome itself, the larger and the gladder faith has champions who not merely speak with conviction, but are heard with a responsive eagerness which proclaims their speaking to be a veritable word of God. In saying that, I am not thinking of the surface aspects of Modernism and Broad Churchmanship and the New Theology. I am rather thinking of the inner stress and passion behind these movements, the urge not of a theory, not of an ecclesiastical policy, not even of a restatement of doctrine, but the urge of man's very soul, weary at last of patent wells and filters, and seeking nothing less than the water of life itself. The one man for whom I am profoundly sorry is that man in all the churches who is standing hot and thirsty and yet refusing to drink. He looks for the old cup and it isn't there. He sees the new, only to find fault that it isn't the old. There is no idolatry so pitiful as that of mistaking the cup for the spring. Now, where do we stand in this great movement? I, for one, should answer, we do not stand—we, too, are moved and moving. The question—what shall our attitude be to this new interest in vital religion?—is surely a question which answers itself. What can our attitude be but one of glad and ungrudging welcome. "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets." We can never go back on our own first principle—

the truth is not a local tributary, it is not a denominational river, it is an ocean broad and deep that touches every shore of human thought and endeavour. There is just as much sea now as ever; the only difference is, and it is a mighty one, there are more ships going the same way as ourselves. If any one thinks that is a pity, then the real pity is that there is any one capable of thinking such a thought. For a long time we have been "alone on a wide, wide sea," but now, thank God, the horizon is dotted with many a friendly sail. But here we meet what to many is a very serious difficulty. Who, it is asked, Who are these others who are now sailing so near us? Their sailing orders seem the same, the sweep of their lines the same, their route the same, their destination the same, but the name painted on the bow is not our name, and the colour on the funnel is not our colour. It is perfectly true, but what of that? It is surely not the name on the bow or the colour on the funnel that makes the ship go. For myself, I have just to make this public confession that I have never yet been able to get up any steam from a pot of paint. One set of landsmen keep telling me I can never put to sea with a name like this or that; another set tells me I can never put to sea without it. I never mind them. Paint! They can paint it tartan if they like. Meantime, I want coals, and plenty of them, to keep the fire going. Our opportunity lies this day not in the cut of our figurehead nor in the colour of our funnel, but in the cargo we carry and how we are carrying it. We have paid far too much attention to the good folk who have kept on insisting that we have thrown so much overboard that we have now no cargo left. Very well, if it satisfies them to say so, so be it. There was a time when I used to slow down and show them that they were greatly mistaken; but I have learned better since then. I now tell them cheerily that the first of April's past, and I steam ahead. When I remember how we have been criticised both without and within, how we have been ostracised and misrepresented, how we have been called cold and negative and dead, the wonder is to me that we are here at all. Cold! How did they find that out? I am always assured it is from personal experience. Just that; no man feels the cold so intensely as he who has the influenza in his own bones. We have only one unanswerable answer to give to those who tell us that we are dead, and that is not to lie down and moan something about the beating of our pulse, but to get up and go about our own business. It is very kind of them to prepare for the funeral, but since we won't be there, that is their business and not ours. Our business—and here is our opportunity, whether theologies rise or fall, grow broad or narrow, whatever names others call us or we call ourselves—our essential business is to touch the inmost centre of man's religious life. To-day, as ever, man's deepest hunger, his keenest thirst is for God, and he can be satisfied permanently with nothing less. Our opportunity here is so great that words cannot express it. The dead hand does not grip us from below, the living



hand does not threaten us in front. We have no impedimenta, no cumbrous body of spent theology to keep us back from the main issue. We have the enormous advantage of being able to get directly and at once to man's very soul. What is this but our golden opportunity to present religion on its own natural basis, to appeal to the spirit of God which is present, however latent it may be in every son of man? Let no one say this is excluding the social question or any other crying question of our day. It is doing nothing of the kind; it is including them all, and it is doing more—it is creating the atmosphere in which alone such problems can be solved. Let us put our emphasis on the main theme and we have nothing to fear. The changes all about us and in our own churches—these changes will be our opportunity. On a night of storm on one of the Scotch lochs two fishermen were in grave peril. The one called to the other, "Hey, Donald, hav' ye a licht?" and the answer came back through the darkness, "Aye, Dugald, but it's oot." A light that's "oot" is poor comfort to a soul wandering in the dark. Let us be sure that we have a light, a light that's in and burning, and we can go down into the blackest darkness undaunted and undismayed.

#### THE MEANING OF A CHURCH.

The Rev. J. H. WEATHERALL asked what was the meaning of a church—the centres of rivalries, controversies, and bitterness of spirit innumerable? That, to his mind, was not the meaning of the word church, although the word was used for it. The controversies and the bitter-nesses came from the circumference and not from the centre. Those who gathered as members of churches should remember for the good of their lives what was precisely the inner meaning of a church. He took it that the inner meaning was the indestructible fact that all of them in the depth of their souls wanted to be good, and the second fact of experience was that they could never be good in isolation. As certainly as a man needed bodily life by bread, so did he need spiritual good for the good of his soul. The welfare of a man depended on the fact of the recognition of this law and seeking after spiritual food, and with the whole of his strength trying to attain unto it. If his intellect could not guide him in his personal search, and history and experience did not teach him the ways to righteousness, he might get it by contagion with men who had it. That fact was at the basis of all the church organisation in every land and every age—that one primary recognition of the necessity of goodness to the inner life of man. Experience showed that that want was never satisfied by a man in his own private prayers, but was only satisfied when two or three were gathered together, and, better still, when multitudes and masses joined in the same confession—confessing the same need. It was said that outside the church there was no salvation—that was outside the church which rested deliberately on that one confession that they needed to be together to teach each other and keep each other strong. The hunger for that salvation was rooted

within us by the Creator, and for that reason the church had tried to express its faithfulness to the meaning of a divine society. Other things came from the inner meaning of a divine society that was so closely related to it as to belong to the inner conscience. They asked, why should a man be good? The answer came in the prayer, "Lord God, Thou hast made us for Thyself, and restless is our heart within us until it rests in Thee." That also belonged to the inner meaning of the church, and much of the rest was dust and ashes. Why was it that the church failed to express its meaning so continually? Partly because it was hypnotised by tradition, and partly because, even in the church, the little jealousies of men were not easily eradicated, but chiefly because while members of the church would not give their strength to the church, it was trying to give its strength to them, because they called the preaching dull when they went a few times a year, because they had the feeling of being an audience instead of being worshippers, because they forgot the primary meaning of their association together. They could not catch the simple human hunger after righteousness from their neighbours when they worshipped together, and the church failed to express its meaning, because they were so often the critic instead of the worshipper, because they said there was no distinction between the minister and his people, and left it to the minister to say their prayers for them, and because they were ashamed to speak the name of God in a public place. This inner meaning of the church was the meaning to which they must all try and get back, forgetting the base things that were behind, the rivalries and the horrible things that clustered round the word "ecclesiastical," and come back to their simple human nature and their simple human need in common worship and aspirations for the eternal satisfaction of the hunger that was within, and so once again try to find the inner meaning of their association together. Then, again, their churches might become the prompters of conduct, the elucidators of their social problems, and the remedy against blackness, darkness, and despair.

The hymn "Forward be our Watchword" was then sung, and the Benediction, pronounced by the Rev. Joseph Wood, brought a memorable meeting to a close.

WHILE a healthy body helps to make a healthy soul, the reverse is yet more true. Mind lifts up, purifies, sustains the body. Mental and moral activity keeps the body healthy, strong, and young, preserves from decay and renews life.—*J. F. Clarke.*

It depends so largely on the care we take of the soul whether we can feel within us and around us the stainless omnipresence of the Holy Spirit; God respects our liberty as the condition of all true love of Him, and will not take away our power of resisting or turning from Him, that He may stamp Himself on us as a superscription. The kingdom of heaven is heart recognition, and heart obedience to a Father's spirit living and ruling within our own.—*John Hamilton Thom.*

#### THE SUSTENTATION FUND.

REPORT AS TO THE FUND PRESENTED TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE AT BOLTON, APRIL 21.

In the report presented to the Triennial Conference at Oxford in 1906, the managers had to record the loss of Mr. Harry Rawson, and they have now with equal regret, to report the death of Mr. A. W. Worthington, B.A., J.P., on June 24, 1907.

At the origin of the fund in 1882, he was appointed secretary, jointly with Rev. S. A. Steinthal and the late Mr. Harry Rawson, and he discharged those duties up to the date of his death.

During the whole of those 25 years he was the acting-secretary on whom devolved the actual work, and it is impossible to adequately express the obligation that the Fund owe to him for his constant and careful attention to its affairs.

Having himself served a long period in the ministry, his sympathy with his brother ministers was whole-hearted, while he also possessed a business capacity that was of inestimable service not only to the Fund, but to the congregations whom the Fund was designed to help.

Of the many public and philanthropic bodies of which he was a member, none claimed a greater share of his attention than the Sustentation Fund, and no one will ever know the extent of the correspondence he conducted on its behalf, or the patient care with which he entered into every detail of the work of the Fund.

Since the inception of the Fund he was only on one occasion, owing to temporary ill-health, absent from the meetings of the Board, and one of the last acts that he performed was to prepare the Agenda for the meeting, which was to take place two days after his death.

In recording this loss that the Fund has sustained, we can only be thankful that Mr. Worthington was spared to us so long to assist in the establishment of the Fund in its present state of efficiency, and to be an example to others to bring the same self-devotion to the interests of the congregations and ministers of our Free Churches.

The managers have also to record other losses by death amongst their number. Mr. Charles W. Jones, J.P., who was a member of the Board during the first ten years of the Fund's existence, and since 1884 one of the Trustees. His sound business judgment, and the intimate knowledge that he had acquired of our denominational institutions were ever at the disposal of the Board. Mr. David Ainsworth, who took an active part in the establishment of the Fund and served as its first president in the years 1884 and 1885, and remained a manager up to the date of his death. The Rev. W. James, who represented the Welsh congregations on the Board, and by whose personal knowledge the Managers were much assisted in making the Welsh grants.

On the other hand the Board has been strengthened by the election of Mr. T. A. Colfox, of Bridport, the Rev. James Harwood, B.A., and the Rev. W. N. Drummond B.A., as managers. It is believed that the counsel of the Rev. W. H. Drummond, in dealing with the Irish applications and grants will be of special benefit, as hitherto it has not been possible to obtain the



assistance of a gentleman with equal knowledge of local conditions. It is also hoped that, when a vacancy occurs, it may be possible to elect another manager to replace the late Rev. W. James as a representative of the Welsh congregations.

The managers are glad to be able to report that the subscriptions to the Fund are well maintained, and amounted in 1908 to £451 10s. 2d., whilst the receipt of legacies of £10 from Miss M. E. Mills, of £500 from Mr. Edwin Clephan, and of £2,000 from Mr. C. A. Tate, together with Donations from various sources amounting to £194 9s. 8d., have enabled the investments of the Fund to be increased at December 31, 1908, to £27,591.

The income of the Fund has thus enabled the managers to distribute grants during the three past years equal to an average of rather more than £1,200 per annum.

The managers have always felt that a serious responsibility rested upon them in the distribution of the income of the Fund, and while they are satisfied that in the majority of cases the Grant is almost a necessity to the maintenance of the Congregations so assisted, it has been suggested that in other instances the knowledge that application can be made to such a Fund acts as an inducement to lessen the contributions of the members of some congregations. With a view to testing the correctness or otherwise of this hypothesis a statement has been most carefully compiled by which it was shown that of the 55 applications for grants considered in 1908, the ministers of 32 congregations receive a larger stipend than when the Fund's first grant was made, eight ministers receive the same stipend, while 15 receive a smaller stipend. There have, of course, been exceptional circumstances in the cases of some of these 15, such as the loss of one or more individual subscriptions of large amount, which account for the reduction that has taken place, but in the majority of those cases it is a fact that the mainstay of the income of the congregation is derived from an endowment.

This is not the place or time to enter upon a discussion of the advantages or otherwise of endowments to congregational life and activity, but in the distribution of the funds entrusted to their care the managers feel obliged to consider whether the congregation is bearing its share of the support of its minister, as the Fund was clearly established to be an added assistance to such effort, and not to encourage a lessened sense of responsibility.

There must necessarily be occasions in which there may be a difference of opinion as to whether a grant from the Fund is thoroughly justified, and in such cases the managers have frequently been glad to avail themselves of the advice and assistance of the various district Associations, whose local knowledge must be more definite than that of a Central Board of Managers. But it may be stated that although not infrequently an application is deferred for further information, it is never declined without some very definitely sufficient reason, the managers considering that they are carrying out the spirit of their Trust more by a possible error on the side of leniency than by a too rigid adherence to the letter of their Regulations.

In conclusion, the managers feel no hesitation in affirming that the Fund is to-day a necessary adjunct to the congregational life of our Free Churches, and if in some few cases there is a question as to whether a particular grant has been judiciously made, the great majority of the grants are such as will be unanimously approved as a means of helping our ministers to maintain their positions with less difficulty, and in some cases of saving our poorer congregations from extinction.

CHARLES C. COE,  
President.

#### NOTES OF THE WEEK.

At the Annual Assembly of the Baptist Union on Monday, the secretary, Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, reported a denominational decrease of 5,869 members, of 115 Sunday-school teachers, of 8,816 Sunday scholars, of 70 local preachers, and of 55 pastors. These figures were the more remarkable in view of the fact that there were 29 more churches, and 45 more preaching places, with accommodation for 23,451 more worshippers. Then, too, nearly £90,000 had been expended on new chapels, and £50,000 on chapel improvements and school extensions, and £80,000 had been raised in reduction of building debts.

Dr. NEWTON MARSHALL moved a resolution on peace, and the Rev. Harry Youlden, of Liverpool, seconded in a speech received with overwhelming enthusiasm. Among other things, Mr. Youlden said that the Church had too long stood the sponsor for war. At the time of the South African war, prayers were offered both in St. Paul's Cathedral and on the veldt for victory to the British arms. "To whom were these people praying?" he asked. "To a horrid god of battles, not to the Holy Father of the peace-loving Jesus Christ." He said it was in the power of certain persons through political agencies and through the Press to fill the country with combustible thoughts and passions which at any moment might explode into war. As for preparedness for war being the best guarantee of peace, Mr. Youlden said, "It is the man who has his finger on the trigger of the loaded revolver who is always anxious to shoot."

THE new President of the Baptist Union is Principal J. T. Marshall, of the Manchester Baptist College. Principal Marshall is a well-known Aramaic scholar. He has written commentaries on Job and Ecclesiastes, and the Old Testament in general is his forte. It was therefore fitting he should take as the subject of his Presidential address, "The Permanent Value of the Old Testament." Dr. Marshall, though a critic of the conservative school, said he must admit that in the first four books of the Pentateuch at least three documents were interwoven, and that most of Deuteronomy represented a fourth document. A right appraisal of the theology of the Old Testament involved the idea of progressive revelation. The conception of God's spirituality was a development. This idea of a progressive

revelation blunted the edge of many ethical objections to the Old Testament, particularly in the case of the imprecatory Psalms. No hostile criticism could ever rob the Old Testament of its religious value. "It is," he said, "a book of experimental religion. The controversy as to the higher criticism does not touch the religious essence of our faith, except it be to make the Old Testament religion more intelligible."

THE Methodist papers have all contained respectful notices of the late Dr. Rigg, who was the best known and one of the ablest Wesleyans of the old school. He was born in January 1821, and was thus over 88 years old at the time of his death. He was a Wesleyan from Wesleyans, his father being a Wesleyan minister, and his mother the daughter of a Wesleyan missionary. He was at one time a contributor to a Wesleyan paper called the *Watchman*; he became connected with the *London Quarterly*, first as contributor, then as joint editor, and for a time as sole editor. He was thirty-five years Principal of Westminster Training College; he served for six years on the London School Board; was a Denominationalist in educational policy; and for many years he and Hugh Price Hughes fought bloodless battles in committees, conferences, and newspapers. Twice he was elected President of the Wesleyan Conference, in 1878 and 1892. Sir Percy Bunting speaks of him as a thoughtful, scholarly, statesmanlike figure; adding significantly "We lay Dr. Rigg reverently to rest, and pass on."

Dr. MARCUS DODS, who passed away on Monday, in his seventy-sixth year, had been since 1889 Professor of New Testament theology in Edinburgh, and for twenty-five years before that minister of the Renfield Free Church, in Glasgow. He was educated in Glasgow, and licensed in the Free Church of Scotland, in 1858, but for many years remained a "stickit minister," though of growing reputation as a scholar and author. He was appointed Principal of New College on the death of the late Dr. Rainy, but ill health prevented him from taking up the duties. Scotland loses in him a foremost scholar and a man of wide influence, both as a minister and as a college teacher.

THE *Methodist Recorder* has published statistics of the March Quarterly Meetings which show that the Wesleyan Conference when it meets by-and-by at Lincoln, will again have to consider the unpleasant fact of a decrease in the number of members. The number of members is given as 490,744, a decrease of 1,262; there is also a slight decline in the number of persons on trial, and in the number of junior members. The heavier decreases are in Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, Hull, and York. The most satisfactory returns were from the London districts.

IN response to many requests the memorial fund which is to provide a portrait of the late Miss Marian Pritchard, and is being collected from the Sunday Schools of the Kingdom, will remain open for another fortnight.



## DR. S. A. ELIOT AT OXFORD.

ON Monday and Tuesday last, just before leaving England, Dr. S. A. Eliot gave two lectures to the students of Manchester College, Oxford. They were given in the Junior Common Room as informally as possible, and the students much appreciated the opportunity of conversation which followed.

The point Dr. Eliot wished to drive home was that truth must be spread through personality. The lectures were on the equipment of the minister and its application. The minister was neither a priest nor an orator, but a religious preacher. And as such, to convey his teaching to men, he must do it through the expression provided by the intellect. At the present day the religious teacher had a great opportunity. The influence of democracy, with the consequent spread of education, more and more forced men to stand on their own merits and the truth of their message, not on any official respect and imputed virtue. Dr. Eliot enumerated the subjects of study most serviceable to a minister. A minister could not find time to study everything. He was forced to select. Literature, Dr. Eliot ranked highest, particularly English literature; next came history. Besides the more usual subjects of theological study, he advocated the knowledge of subjects such as political economy and some branch of natural history. He rather depreciated the usefulness of a knowledge of languages. He confessed that he had never learned Hebrew, and never felt any loss from his ignorance.

In the second lecture Dr. Eliot, while disclaiming the intention of complete analysis, gave some elements of which the essential personality was composed. Conviction of the reality of the things not seen was the first. The great peril was of becoming entangled in the machinery of theological controversy, of ecclesiastical forms, or of conventional observances. It was truth verified through experience which worked. The second need was the historic sense, the consciousness of the unity and continuity of the process by which God was unfolding all things. "Live upon the past, in the present, for the future."

Thirdly, Dr. Eliot insisted that this personality was developed only in freedom.

More specific ways to temper and forge the weapon was next enumerated.

Spiritual vitality was like spiritual vitality, only preserved by action. Moderation was sometimes criticised, but as the heat of steam was greatest when under pressure, so passion was greatest when under control. A sense of proportion was necessary, if only to save waste. A minister had the opportunity to do twenty times as much as he was able. Which twentieth was he to select? Dr. Eliot told of a certain minister who once complained of being over-worked. Upon inquiry, it appeared that he regarded it as part of his duty to meet every train that came in to welcome any chance sympathiser.

Again, the minister should have clear and definite convictions. The nebulous word had little effect. Theology, of course, was not religion, but it was the intellectual expression of it. Theological efficiency did

not mar preaching; the greatest theologians, Luther and Channing, to name two, had often been the greatest preachers. Last to be mentioned, but the corner stone of the edifice, came consecration, character, example. Attraction was ever more potent than command. Dr. Eliot concluded with a most cheerful description of the minister's privileges. It was often a slow and weary business to force a reluctant world along the right road, but as Phillips Brooks once said, what fun there is in it!

R. V. H.

Dr. Eliot also preached in the College Chapel on Sunday morning, and on Tuesday afternoon bade farewell to a little group of friends who came in to greet him at Essex Hall before his departure for home. He sailed on Wednesday from Southampton by a N.D.L. boat for New York. The last little gathering was at the instance of the Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The President was there, and also Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice of New Zealand, who is on a visit to this country. Sir Robert is a member of the Unitarian Church at Wellington, and will take part in our anniversary meetings in Whit week. These lines will quickly follow Dr. Eliot across the Atlantic, and greet him once more, we trust, soon after his return to Boston. Let them assure him once more of the delight his brief visit has been to us all, and the stimulus and encouragement we have derived from his presence in our midst. Next year he must come again, with many comrades, to be with us at the International meetings in Berlin.

## RIVINGTON PIKE.

DURING my stay in Bolton, one morning I went up Rivington Pike, a summit outside the town, with Mr. Bose, B.A., my Indian friend. After seeing the sublime scenery, I wrote a number of Japanese short poems. Here I dare give my own English translation of some of the original verses, and I dedicate them to my Bolton friends, in remembrance of the kind hospitality which they extended to a visitor from the Far East.

One from the Himalayan heights,  
And one from Fugi's summit fair,  
Together on the hill we stand  
And hail the home of hymn and prayer.

Though Spring doffs not her coat of mist,  
Her mantle dark of clouded grey,  
The carpet spread beneath her feet  
Proclaims the joyous Season's sway.

The red brick buildings far and wide  
Are scattered o'er the boundless green;  
And, gem-like in this setting fair,  
The lakes display their silver sheen.

And as the lakes with plenteous store  
Supply the sea-ports' great demand,  
So may God's Spirit now descend  
In showers upon the thirsty land.

S. UCHIGASAKI.

Manchester College, Oxford.

FROM Hastings on April 16, a P.O. for 3s. 4d. reached the INQUIRER office, without anything to show its purpose or from whom it came.

## IN THE ACADEMY.

THIS year's exhibition of the Royal Academy, which opens to the public on Monday presents as queer a jumble of pictures as ever, and no gleam of hope, so far as we can see, for the dawning of some better day for British Art.

Life there certainly is in E. A. Hornel's "The Chase" (630), and it is perhaps the most vigorous picture in the whole collection. The children will not catch the butterfly, and it is pleasant to watch their eager faces. H. H. La Thangue's "Shaking down Cider Apples" (53) is also vivid in colour, in a different way, such as belongs to his accustomed manner. Edward Stott's "Two Mothers" (58) is another very attractive picture, and "A Little Shrine, Kyoto, Japan" (97), shows that Alfred Parsons has gone further afield than usual for his flowers. Mr. E. T. Compton again delights us with his "Alpine Fastness" (256), MacWhirter offers a refreshing variety of subjects, notably 44, 102, and 832, and for children "Us" (701), by Keith Henderson, is one of the best. In the Water Colour Room, look at "The Shepherd's Queen" (880), by Lexden L. Pocock. There also is A. R. Quinton's "The Wye Valley and Bredon Hill" (830). But surely *Wye* is a mistake. Bredon Hill is circled by the Avon, and is seen from the Severn Valley; but the Wye is far away, with Malvern and the Forest of Dean in between.

In the Central Hall, among the sculpture, one seems to tumble straight into Brobdingnag, for there is the model of a huge statue of Cecil Rhodes (1,656), by Henry Pegram, which is to be erected in Cape Town.

Of the portraits, one of the most interesting is Briton Riviere's of the present Lord Tennyson (134), with a noble hound by his side. Solomon J. Solomon's portrait of the Prime Minister (147) is not so happy. Herkomer's portrait of Sir John Brunner is an admirable likeness, so far as the face is concerned, but the gorgeous Court dress seems rather to conceal the man we know and honour. Two other portraits of special interest to many of our readers are G. Hall Neale's of Mr. James Samuelson (737), and Sir Edward Russell (671), and there is actually the *Hibbert Journal* in the Academy! Sir Edward has a copy unmistakably on his knee.

A few more notes of personal interest may be added here. Mr. George Wetherbee has two of his pleasant pastorals (7 and 646) in this exhibition, and Mr. W. Follen Bishop appears not in the Water Colour Room this year, but with a picture in oils, "Grey Dawn is Breaking" (711). In the Water Colour Room Mr. Arthur Rackham has, not one of his charming fairy fancies, but a more serious picture, "Drifting" (964), and among the miniatures is a portrait of Mrs. William Rathbone (1,008), by Nellie M. H. Edmunds. In the Black and White Room we are very glad to see Mr. Edmund New's drawing of "The Towers of Oxford" (1,246); there also is a portrait of Mrs. Rylett (1,363), by Margaret Winsor. Another familiar name appears in the Architectural Room, "Kirkdale Manor" (1,399), by Sydney D. Kitson.



## OBITUARY.

### MR. JAMES PARSONS, F.G.S.

AFTER three months' search, the body has been found of Mr. James Parsons, B.Sc., F.G.S., Principal of Mineral Survey, Ceylon, son of the late Dr. Parsons, F.R.C.S. Eng., and was interred at Nuwara Eliya on the 14th inst., the news coming by cable to his relatives in Bristol.

Mr. Parsons had been engaged in research work in Ceylon; and some years previously was with Sir John Murray on the Lake Survey of Scotland.

He was an earnest student of philosophic thought, and attended Oakfield-road Church, Clifton, during the ministry of the Rev. J. Frederick Smith, to whom he was greatly attached.

This note confirms the sorrowful surmise of the notice which appeared in the *INQUIRER* of February 27. It was on December 29, 1908, that Mr. Parsons disappeared.

### Mr. J. B. WOSTINHOLM.

MR. JOSEPH BECKETT WOSTINHOLM, of Sheffield, who passed away at Malton on Friday, April 23, in his 74th year, was a familiar figure in his native city and was well known throughout the country, for he had been for 38 years secretary of the Yorkshire County Cricket Club. In our own fellowship he was held in high regard. He was a life-long member of the Upper Chapel, and was one of those who in early life was kindled by the missionary zeal of Brooke Herford, and joined in the establishment of the mission church at Upperthorpe.

The funeral service on Tuesday, at the City-road Cemetery, Sheffield, prior to cremation, proved by the large and representative gathering of friends in what high regard Mr. Wostinholm was held. The service was conducted by the Rev. A. H. Dolphin, of Upperthorpe, and the Rev. C. J. Street, of Upper Chapel, who delivered the address.

"A typical Yorkshireman of the good old school," so Mr. Street described their friend; sturdy in his independence, and of strenuous life. His breezy nature was refreshing to all who came in contact with him, and his cheery welcome was something to remember. He was a man of true unselfishness, generous in the use of ample means and talents for the common good.

As a Freemason he had held high and honourable rank, and his deep religious conviction gave the greatest force to his character. He did not talk much of religion, but it was the moving spring of his being, to which his life bore witness. A staunch and sturdy Unitarian, proud of his faith and its name, he strove always by the love of man to prove the reality of his love of God. Mr. Street referred also to his life-long connection with Upper Chapel, and his generous support of Upperthorpe, and added: "None of us who were privileged to be present last January at the jubilee meeting of the Upperthorpe Church are likely to forget the moving speech which from the chair he made on that memorable occasion, or the rousing reception which the meeting gave him. It was the crown of his career,

and I verily believe the proudest day of his life, though there had been not a few occasions when, perhaps under more distinguished auspices, high honour had been rendered to him by those who felt it was due."

A united memorial service is to be held to-morrow (Sunday) in Upper Chapel.

### IN THE CROW'S NEST.

A LAST letter from this Pfarrhaus. I underwent my ordeal at Lü to-day. The Lüers are very grateful to their British helpers, and want to make me a present; but I hope to persuade them to give the money to their Bell Fund.

Barry accompanied me, as usual, and spent the time of service in the sexton's house, guarding my alpenstock. If he has something to watch, he is content. But, if he is left free, his habit of treating every house I enter as my house leads to inconvenience, for he fails to make due distinctions. Late comers to church find him on sentry duty before the door. Unless he knows them he refuses them admittance in such emphatic terms that he disturbs devotion. Even that is easier to bear than his behaviour at Cierfs, where the tones of the ancient organ pierce him to the heart, and draw forth the most poignant tones in his register.

This is the fox-terrier that fell in love with Corva, ran after her sledge all the way to Glurns in the Tyrol, haunted the Pfarrhaus day and night, until his master (known familiarly as Tumasch, and resident in Lüsai) sent me a message: "I have no joy more in the dog. If the Signor Révérend will accept him without price, behold, I give him. Else must I shoot him down." So we stole him to save his life.

It has been his rule to visit the children of Tumasch every day, and also, since we were in England, the family which then took care of him. But in these last days he has seen signs, and has stayed by my side, and slept at the foot of my bed. Now and again he has come to me with sad eyes, and said things hard to resist. But the awful English quarantine, and the danger of English streets to a mountain dog, make it impossible to do what he asks. So I took him to-day to Valcava, to his new mistress, and came back without him. And his wistful face and beseeching tail will not away from my vision. On the way back I found the first crocus. But what is the use of a crocus, when you want a dog?

And, nevertheless, there is a dog in my barn at this moment; a splendid full-blood setter, called Caro, of Cierfs. When I came back I found him on my doorstep. "I hear," observed this animal, "that you have a vacancy for a dog. So here I am." And here he is indeed. Nothing would induce him to depart. An hour after his last expulsion I saw him sitting on the snow, with the evident intention of sitting there all night if necessary. So I let him through, to sleep with greater comfort among the hay.

The son of the old bear-hunter joined me on the way to Lü. (Why should a bürger of Fuldera make his communion in Lü? Ah, that is a long story. The

whole of his clan has a genius for music, and, as you know, men who are easily touched with concourse of sweet sounds are apt to be touchy at other points. The strife is only between cousins at present. Not long ago it had actually severed father and son, but by great good luck the bear-hunter's son-in-law made a murderous attack on him, and was almost destroyed by this friend of mine, who rushed to his father's help. The district court fined them all three, and since then they are at one.) We naturally talked dog, and he told me a true tale.

When his father was a young lad, in charge of goats just above Fuldera, a bear suddenly appeared, with designs upon a she-goat. The young goatherd's little dog charged that bear with a gallant war-cry, and his master sped to the village to raise the alarm. In a few minutes a man with a gun was upon the scene, but neither bear, goat, nor dog was to be descried. Our future bear-hunter, who had lost his hat in the race to the houses, went bare-headed through the forest, calling his charge together, and by nightfall he had collected them all. Not one was lost. But the poor dog did not appear.

Three days later, as the wind was somewhat cold, the lad thought he might as well look for his hat. After some search he found it, and upon it, guarding his master's property, an emaciated dog. After checking the bear, and giving the goats time to scatter into safety, he had in his simple way turned to the next of his duties, which was obviously to protect that fugitive hat until its owner came to claim it. Call him a good dog, pat him kindly, give him your bread and cheese—he is as happy as a cherub, and ready for any canine job that offers.

I told my musical comrade the story of the stone which F. P. C. and H. D. R. have set on the brow above Red Tarn, on Helvellyn. I told it some weeks ago to our schoolmaster, as we came back from a rather remarkable conference of teachers at Santa Maria. (We had unanimously adopted a resolution urging that a reading-book, so framed as to encourage total abstinence from alcohol, should be prepared and introduced into every school.) He capped my tale with another.

A young man and his sweetheart wanted to climb the Falknis. A friend, named, Kuoni, of Mayenfeld, went with them as guide, and took his dog. As they skirted a precipice the girl slipped, and fell outwards. Her fiancé caught at her arm, and was carried over the edge. Kuoni made a desperate effort to save them both, and shared their fate. They were found dead at the foot of the rocks. So far a commonplace incident of the Alps. But with them was found a dead dog, and this is unusual. Some one had the curiosity to track the dog's footmarks. They ran along on the side further from the dangerous edge up to the place of the accident. They then approached the precipice, and showed above the traces of that fatal slip, where the snow was swept smooth. They receded, and went in great strides to a place where, for a dog, the descent was safe, and there descended, until they came to the human bodies. They circled



about the corpse of Kuoni, the dog's master. They returned along the route of the dog's descent. They led back to the spot where the three had plunged to their death. And there they ended in the marks of a sudden leap. The dog had gone to join his master.

It seems to me a trifle mean to cut these creatures up alive, in order to see how they are made.

This last incident happened some ten years ago. Our schoolmaster's authority for it is Kuoni's wife, the dog's mistress. My last letter from the Pfarrhaus. It is not what you would call a convenient house, but I am sorry to leave it. In this room, with its floor, ceiling, and walls of unvarnished stone-pine, the first school in Fuldera was held. Generations of confirmands have been prepared in it. Pfarrer Helber lived here with his dog, until the dog died. And behind this same huge, ungainly stove the poor man tried, long and vainly, to warm his cold comrade back to life. At night they heard the martin treading on its hard claws in the loft overhead, and paid no more heed to it than Barry and I. The bare sulér, leading straight through from door to barn, the cellars and threshing-floor underneath, leading to the byre and stable under the hay, the low doorways, where Gamaliel bumped his head, the stove in the Stube, where he lay at full length when he played hide-and-seek with irreverent Corvuli, the queer Stube itself, with its old-world cabinets built into the wall, the little chamber reached by the trap-door, the dangerous, crooked staircase, the rustic balconies and grimy kitchen, with no proper outlet for its smoke, are all sacred to the memory of nameless generations. To them, as to us, every window was a picture of the glory of God.

What though they must fetch their water from the bügl at the far end of the village? They recked not a whit. Pipe-water in the houses never entered the range of their thoughts. (What trouble we had to prevent Gamaliel marching off with our buckets and becoming a Gibeonite!) Peasants lived here, and then schoolmasters, and then Pfarrer. The house has individuality, has even, in its humble way, distinction.

It is the only house of mine where I have had Gamaliel as a guest. And the others, too, who have been here, how glad they have been, and how glad they have made us! I came here yesterday, and I have lived here a thousand years. Good-bye, old house, friendly shelter of men and beasts under one long roof. My dog has gone already, and to-morrow I go too.

E. W. LUMMIS.

*Easter Monday, Fuldera.*

THE halo of the moral ideal may rest upon the commonest conditions of life, and fill it with an unsuspected nobleness.—Charles Beard.

LIVE in a thankful spirit, and you will find more and more to be thankful for. Begin by resolving not to forget your mercies and you will gradually come to feel the thought of them a constant inspiration of happiness.—Brooke Herford.

## THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN.

### BIRD-STUDY IN SPRING.

#### III.

If you want to see a most exquisitely finished nest you should aim at finding one built by chaffinches. Look for it in apple trees, also in closely-clipped hawthorn hedges. Old hedges and old apple trees are preferred to young ones, for on these the nest is more easily attached to the bole or some crossed branches. It is built by the male and female working together, and working most busily. They lash it to the tree with wool; this lashing is easiest when the bark is rough, and young trees have smooth bark. The other materials used are dry grass, fine roots, and moss; it is lined with hair and feathers, and is ornamented outside with bits of white lichen. This lichen is probably put on as a help to concealment, for lichen is common on old apple trees and hawthorns. The cuplike nest will contain greenish purple eggs streaked and spotted with purple brown. As the chaffinch builds two or three times in a season a careful search is likely to be rewarded. Chaffinches, like redstarts and several other birds, tell you plainly when you are near their nests, for they fidget about restlessly.

The wren is a very tiny brown bird with a short cocked-up tail, and is plainly marked with bars of darker brown or black, running crosswise. This common, or Jenny wren, is not at all shy. If you are quiet she will let you sit on the bank on one side of a lane while she builds on the other. She sees you, but she trusts you. Be worthy of her confidence. Her nest is quite as beautifully made as the chaffinch's; but it is not so easy to find, nor to look into when found, for it has a dome, and is entered from the outside. The entrance is so small that a good sized thimble would stop it up.

As this is a late spring, such birds as the blackbird and thrush, which build early, run great risk of having their nests discovered and robbed, for they often build in bare hedges, and seldom more than four feet from the bottom of the hedge. The nests of these two species are very common, so you should be prepared to recognise them. Seen from outside, they look very much alike, but one glance inside will tell you which is which, for the blackbirds are not plasterers like the thrushes.

Have you noticed that thrushes have full round breasts? these breasts are their trowels. When their nests are formed they spread within them a mud-like substance, and smooth it by turning round and round so as to press their breasts against this plaster. The song-thrushes' eggs are unmistakable, for they are blue, and have black spots on them, chiefly at the thick end.

You would much like to see an owl, would you not? Don't look for one; listen instead. Owls only hoot and screech after dusk, and their very fluffy wings make no sound when they fly. To what then should you listen? Walk in the late afternoon among trees, tall ones, and listen till you hear the sound of many birds uttering harsh, short, angry notes

as they crowd about a special tree. They are shouting and scolding. Go nearer. If these birds are low down in the tree, and you can see that their attention is directed to something on the ground, you may pass on. They are only scolding a cat. If you see them many feet above you, and they are darting in and out among the boughs at one spot, you may pretty safely say "Owl up there!" The owl, as you know, sleeps during the sunny hours, and is harmless. The little birds know it too, and realise that in broadest daylight no owl will steal their eggs or young birds; so they let the owls alone. When the strong light has begun to soften, Mr. or Mrs. Owl is apt to rouse a little, to stretch a leg, or comb a wing, or merely to open half an eye. The very first smaller bird that sees this raises an alarm, and other birds gather by the dozen and scream at the owl which you will see sitting on a big bough, usually close to the trunk of the tree. The birds dash past the owl again and again, getting closer each time. It is generally a blackbird which dares to go closest; indeed, I have seen one even dare to peck the still drowsy owl. This attack will go on for some minutes, till at last the owl thinks it wise to make for another tree some thirty yards away. It flies thither heavily, followed by the shrieking crowd; whereupon anxious nest owners near the fresh tree begin to scold and dash. After a quarter-of-an-hour of this sort of thing I have known the commotion to cease quite suddenly, the owl being left in peace on the bough. I suspect the cunning bird had pretended to go to sleep.

Another hint for beginners. You see a coloured picture of a bird—say a blue-tit, with much blue and pale canary-yellow about it. You go out on a dull day to look for a blue-tit; but, though you see some small birds that are just like the picture in regard to shape, you think they can hardly be blue-tits because the colours look dingy; but once let the sun come out and a tit get the full rays on its head and breast, and you will say, "Why, that's just like the picture." So, you see, you must take sun and shade into your reckoning.

Here are some sights to be enjoyed in May house-martins "eating mud," as a small girl put it. They are really filling their bills with plastering material for their nests under the eaves. On a dry day they may be seen to follow a water-cart for this purpose: Gulls, following the plough, and alighting on each few yards of newly-turned furrow, to gobble fat grubs and wriggling wireworms which would otherwise live to spoil some portion of the crops: Gulls, again, on the opening brackens, eating a special grub or insect only found there in May: Jackdaws, with glossy round heads and cheerful "tchak tchak!" throwing sticks and clothes-pegs down chimney-pots—their favourite nesting places in a village. All the birds named in this column are to be found in most parts of the United Kingdom in May; as they are all common birds you may look for them with every prospect of success.

EMILY NEWLING.

THERE is endless hope in work,—  
Carlyle.



## ONE OF OUR SINGERS.\*

THE stranger who takes in hand a little book of this kind has a possibility of alternative fate; he may judge for the art market and remain a stranger, or he may taste for himself and find a friend. These "Poems" are not ambitious, yet they are earnest. The music is that of one who has thrilled to the world's best; the themes are serious, the manner careful. Thirty of the pieces are sonnets; most of the rest are brief; none are long. A tender thought, a longing mood, a protesting scorn, a glimpse of transient beauty—these claim the poet's voice by turns, and she sings them not unworthily. The stranger feels that here is one who has sorrowed deeply, borne much, meditated fruitfully. Something there is in such sincerity that puts literary criticism into a secondary place: but since even there it has duties to perform, what truer homage can it pay the poet than sincerity in turn? Let us say, then, that the sonnet-form, with its capacity for grave and measured argument, seems more suited to her than the lyric, and that the blank verse of the opening "Pilgrim's Prayer" attains, in our judgment, a higher level than any other form of writing in the book. We quote, however, from the rhymed pieces, not for the sake of convenience alone. There is something so sacredly poignant in the "Prayer" that the lover of song and of souls must be left to read it in secret. Here is a typically lucid little bit, headed "Lines":

"Let your key be ever bright,  
Forge it out of Life and Light;  
Come you early, come you late,  
It alone unlocks the gate.  
Fear not, child, how far you rove,  
So the key you bear be Love."

Of the sonnets, many centre upon artist subjects, but several bear witness to a mind alert to great social problems. The following, with its unmistakable reference, will surely be tolerated by those whose politics may have differed from the poet's, although but little lapse of time has occurred since the crisis was upon us. If any still censure, there are some who will be glad that a woman wrote this. It is entitled "Orphaned."

"Can this be England, mother of the free,  
England, whose hearths have glowed, a  
beacon flame  
High o'er the world, to guard her sons  
from shame,  
England, whose eyes shone pure as Eng-  
land's sea?  
Can this be England, who from every quay  
Hath poured her thousands forth to kill  
and maim,  
A young, blind kinsman, hard as we to  
tame?  
If this be England, then no English we;  
Orphaned we stand amidst a waste of  
foam  
O'er which are borne mad cries of hate  
and pain,  
Curses of women homeless, men at bay,  
And sullen mutterings of on-coming  
doom  
By outraged conscience reaped. O ere  
that day,  
England, arise! and be thyself again!"

\* Poems. By Dorothea Hollins. (Masters & Co., 1909. pp. 72. Price 2s. 6d. net.)

There is a second sonnet—"Dawn"—expressing hopes that are being to some extent fulfilled; though the atonement must be long, and who shall claim that it can ever be complete?

But the stranger who has not even taken Miss Hollins's book in hand must not be allowed to go away mistaking its prevailing character. Quiet, lowly, clinging to beauty, and in the best sense devout without being affected, her singing leads toward the heights and the purer air. May she find many companionable spirits to go with her.

## NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

[Notices and Reports for this Department should be as brief as possible, and be sent in by Wednesday, or Thursday Morning at latest.]

**Astley.**—The annual school sermons were preached on Sunday last by the Rev. A. Cunliffe Fox, of Moss Side, Manchester. Special anthems were sung by an augmented choir, assisted by an orchestra. Appropriate hymns were sung by the children. Though the weather was rather unfavourable, crowded congregations attended, many friends being present from Leigh, Hindley, Swinton, and Chowbent. The collections and donations amounted to over £22.

**Clifton.**—The two final meetings of the "Charles Lamb" Fellowship of Book Lovers have recently been held in the Oakfield-road Lecture Room. On April 14 Mr. H. Vicars Webb read a paper on "Charles Lamb and His Circle of Friends." Mr. Charles Cole kindly presided. The members took part in readings from Lamb, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Thomas Hood, Leigh Hunt, and Hazlitt. On Wednesday, April 21, the session closed with a lantern address on "Bird-life and Literature," given by Mr. Webb, who dealt with some fifty species of migrant and resident birds. The limelight views of the bird slides, lent by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, were much enjoyed. Mention was made of the best books for beginners in the study of ornithology, and appropriate selections from several of these were read. Mr. J. W. Norgrove's rendering of the "Ode to the Nightingale" (Keats), "To the Cuckoo" (Wordsworth), and "The Swallow's Return" (Franklin), was fully appreciated. Mr. G. H. Kellaway spoke as to the gratifying success of the first session. Eighteen meetings of the Fellowship had been held since its inception in September last. It was hoped to commence another successful session in the autumn.

**Kirkstead, Lincs (Appointment).**—Rev. A. M. Holden, of Warwick, has been appointed by the Lord of the Kirkstead Manor, acting on the nomination of the trustees of the Disney Trust, to succeed his father, the late Rev. Robert Holden, in the ministry of the Presbyterian Chapel. A spontaneous movement, taking the shape of a memorial signed by practically every person in the district, had considerable influence in leading the trustees and the Lord of the Manor to come to their decision. Mr. Holden will probably take up his work at Kirkstead in a few weeks.

**London: Stratford.**—It is proposed to recommence out-door services in connection with the West Ham-lane Unitarian Church during the coming month, and the gift of a small light harmonium, which would be useful for leading the singing in the open air would be gratefully appreciated. The teachers of the Sunday-school would also be glad to receive any spare books suitable for replenishing the scholars' library.

**North Cheshire Unitarian Sunday School Union.**—The annual conversazione was held at Stockport on Saturday, April 17. After tea a meeting of the committee was held, the president, the Rev. George Evans, presiding. The other ministers present were the Revs. W. Harrison, B. C. Constable, A. R. Andrae, H. B. Smith, E. G. Evans, H. E. Perry, and J. Barron. An excellent musical and dramatic entertainment was given by the Stockport friends, including songs, violin solos, an operetta

by the children of the Sunday-school, several items of which were encored, and a short comedy by seven of the elder girls. Mr. C. P. Hough was present on behalf of the Manchester District Sunday-school Association, and was welcomed by the president. In response he delivered an interesting address. Hearty votes of thanks were accorded to the Stockport friends and to the president and duly responded to.

**Trowbridge.**—It is requested that correspondence with respect to Conigre Chapel may be addressed to Mr. W. Walker, J.P., or to Mr. Frank Beer, Avenue-road.

## OUR CALENDAR.

It is requested that notice of any alteration in the Calendar be sent to the Publisher not later than Thursday Afternoon.

## SUNDAY, May 2.

## LONDON.

Acton, Creffield-road, 11.15 and 7, Rev. ARTHUR HURN.  
Bermondsey, Fort-road, 7, Rev. J. HIPPERSON.  
Blackfriars Mission and Stamford-street Chapel, 11 and 7, Rev. J. C. BALLANTYNE.  
Brixton, Unitarian Christian Church, Effra-road, 11 and 7, Rev. G. C. CRESSEY, D.D.  
Child's Hill, All Souls', Weech-road, Finchley-road, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. H. S. PERRIS, M.A.  
Croydon, Free Christian Church, Wellesley-road, 11 and 7, Rev. W. J. JUPP.  
Essex Church, The Mall, Notting Hill Gate, 11 and 7, Rev. FRANK K. FREESTON.  
Forest Gate, corner of Dunbar-road, Upton-lane, 11, Mr. INDEG; 6.30, Mr. C. F. HINTON, B.A.  
Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Chatham-place, 11.15 and 7, Rev. H. RAWLINGS, M.A.  
Hampstead, Rosslyn-hill Chapel, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. H. GOW, B.A.  
Highgate-hill, Unitarian Christian Church, 11 and 7, Rev. A. A. CHARLESWORTH.  
Ilford, High-road, 11, Mr. W. RUSSELL; 7, Rev. J. F. PARMITER.  
Islington, Unity Church, Upper-street, 11 and 7, Rev. E. SAVELL HICKS, M.A.  
Kentish Town, Clarence-road, N.W., 11 and 7, Rev. F. HANKINSON.  
Kilburn, Quex-road, 11 and 7, Rev. CHARLES ROPER, B.A.  
Lewisham, Unitarian Christian Church, High-street, 11 and 7, Rev. W. W. C. POPE.  
Little Portland-street Chapel, 11.15 and 7, Rev. W. WOODING, B.A.  
Mansford-street Church and Mission, Bethnal Green, 7, Rev. GORDON COOPER.  
Peckham, Avondale-road, 11 and 6.30, Mr. H. G. CHANCELLOR.  
Richmond, Free Church, Ormond-road, 11.15 and 7, Rev. GEORGE CRITCHLEY, B.A.  
Stoke Newington Green, 11.15 and 7, Dr. F. W. G. FOAT, B.A. Evening, Communion Service.  
Stratford Unitarian Church, 11, 3, and 6.30, Rev. J. ARTHUR PEARSON. Sunday School Anniversary and Flower Services.  
Wandsworth Unitarian Christian Church, East Hill, 11 and 7, Rev. W. G. TARRANT, B.A.  
Wimbledon, Collegiate Hall, Worple Road, 11 and 7, Rev. W. E. WILLIAMS, B.A.  
Wood Green, Unity Church, 11 and 7, Rev. Dr. MUMMERY.  
Woolwich, Carmel Chapel, Anglesea-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. L. JENKINS JONES.

ABERYSTWTH, New Street Meeting House, 11 and 6.30, E. GLYN EVANS.  
BATH, Trim-street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. McDOWELL.  
BLACKPOOL, Dickson-road, North Shore, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. ROBERT MCGEE.  
BLACKPOOL, South Shore Unitarian Free Church, Lytham-road South, 11 and 6.30.  
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Church, West Hill-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. C. COE.  
BRIGHTON, Free Christian Church, New-road, 11 and 7, Rev. PRIESTLEY PRIME.  
BUXTON, Hartington-road Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GEORGE STREET.  
CAMBRIDGE, Assembly Hall, Downing-street, 11.30 and 7, Rev. E. W. LUMMIS, M.A.



CANTERBURY, Ancient Chapel, Blackfriars, No Service.

CHELTEMHAM, Bayshill Unitarian Church, Royal Well Place, 11 and 7, Rev. J. FISHER JONES.

CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. D. JENKIN EVANS.

DOVER, Adrian-street, near Market-square, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. A. GINEVER, B.A.

DUBLIN, Stephen's Green West, 12 and 7, Rev. F. H. VAUGHAN, B.A.

GUILDFORD, Ward-street Church, North-street, 11 and 6.30, Mr. GEORGE WARD.

HASTINGS, South Terrace, Queen's-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. S. BURROWS.

HORSHAM, Free Christian Church, Worthing-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. J. MARTEN.

LEEDS, Mill Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. C. HARGROVE, M.A.

LEICESTER, Free Christian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. KENNETH BOND.

LEICESTER, The Great Meeting, 11 and 6.30, Rev. EDGAR I. FRIPP, B.A.

LIVERPOOL, Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES CRADDOCK.

LIVERPOOL, Hope-street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. D. ROBERTS.

LIVERPOOL, Ullet-road, Sefton-Park, 11, Rev. J. C. ODGERS, B.A.; 6.30, Rev. M. WATKINS.

MAIDSTONE, Unitarian Church, Earl-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. FARQUHARSON.

NEW BRIGHTON and LISCARD, Memorial Church, Manor-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. ERNEST PARRY.

NEWPORT, Isle of Wight, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. RUDDLE.

OXFORD, Manchester College, 11.30, The Rev. the PRINCIPAL.

PORTSMOUTH, High-street Chapel, 11 and 6.45, Rev. JAMES BURTON, M.A.

PORTSMOUTH, St. Thomas-street, 6.45, Rev. T. BOND.

SCARBOROUGH, Westborough, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. JOSEPH WAIN.

SEVENOAKS, Bessell's Green, The Old Meeting House, 11.

SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11, Rev. S. H. STREET, B.A.; 6.30, Rev. J. W. COCK.

SIDMOUTH, Old Meeting, High-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. WILLIAM AGAR.

SOUTHPORT, Portland-street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. MATTHEW R. SCOTT.

TAVISTOCK, Abbey Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. RATTENBURY HODGES.

TORQUAY, Unity Hall, Lower Union-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. E. O'CONNOR, B.D.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS, Dudley Institute, Dudley-road, 11.

WEST KIRBY, Tynwald Hall, opposite Station (side door), 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. W. HAWKES.

**GERMANY.**

HAMBURG, The Church of the Liberal Faith Logenhaus, Welckerstrasse, 11. Rev. GARDNER PRESTON.

**SOUTH AFRICA.**

CAPETOWN, Free Protestant (Unitarian) Church, Hout-street, 6.45, Rev. RAMSDEN BALMFORTH.

## DEATHS.

RYE.—On April 21, at Suez, on the S.S. "Rhipens," Edward Rye, M.B., of Southport, formerly of Oldham.

WOSTINHOLM.—On April 23, Joseph Beckett Wostinholm, of 343, Sharrow-lane, Sheffield, in his 74th year.

THE REV. JAMES E. STEAD is open to receive appointments after April 25.—Address, 13, Wallwork-terrace, The Hague, Stalybridge.

NEW GRAVEL PIT CHURCH, HACKNEY, Chatham Place, off Paragon Road.

Three Week Evening PUBLIC LECTURES arranged by the London District Unitarian Society will be delivered on Thursday Evenings.

April 29.—Unitarianism and the Modernist Movement. Rev. HENRY GOW, B.A., of Hampstead.

May 6.—Unitarianism and the Individual. Rev. J. ARTHUR PEARSON, of the London District Unitarian Society.

May 13.—Unitarianism and the Problem of Poverty. Rev. W. G. TARRANT, B.A., of Wandsworth.

Doors open at 7.45. Chair at 8 p.m. After each Lecture an opportunity will be given for questions. All are cordially invited.

## CHURCH AND STATE.

### LIBERATION SOCIETY.

#### ANNUAL PUBLIC MEETING,

IN THE CITY TEMPLE,  
WEDNESDAY, May 5, at 7 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ALFRED E. HUTTON, M.P.

Speakers:

Mr. GEORGE R. THORNE, M.P.

Mr. SILAS K. HOCKING.

Rev. W. JUSTIN EVANS.

Doors open, 6.15. Organ Recital, 6.30.  
Tickets for Reserved Seats on application to 16, Caxton House, Westminster, S.W.

### PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY OF LONDON AND THE SOUTH-EASTERN COUNTIES.

#### "ASSEMBLY SUNDAY," MAY 9,

when COLLECTIONS on behalf of the Assembly's Funds will be taken in the Churches which are on the Roll of the Assembly. If not suitable to local arrangements the date is subject to alteration.

FREDERIC ALLEN, Hon. Sec.

### LONDON DOMESTIC MISSION SOCIETY.

THE ANNUAL MEETING will be held in University Hall (Dr. Williams' Library), Gordon-square, on Friday, May 14. The chair will be taken by P. M. Martineau, Esq., at 8.30 p.m. After the business meeting there will be an Address from Rev. H. Cubbon, Warden of Mansfield House, Canning Town, on "University Settlements and Unemployment."

### OPEN SCHOLARSHIPS FOR THE NONCONFORMIST MINISTRY.

DR. WILLIAMS'S TRUSTEES offer for open competition, Undergraduate Scholarships, tenable in the University of Glasgow only; and Divinity Scholarships for Graduates, tenable in any approved School of Theology or University. The Scholarships are open to students of all Denominations preparing for the Nonconformist Ministry. For particulars apply to the Secretary, DR. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY, Gordon-square, London, W.C., before May 20.

TYPEWRITING, SHORTHAND, TRANSLATING. Authors' MSS. accurately copied at reasonable rates. Special quotations for quantities. First-class work guaranteed. Evening and Secretarial work undertaken with Machine; also typing on machine direct from dictation. SERMONS A SPECIALITY.—Miss E. L. STENT, 68, Aldersgate-street, E.C., and 33, Crouch Hall-road, N.

### LONSDALE TYPEWRITING BUREAU,

19, Lonsdale Chambers, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W. C.

#### RELIGIOUS TYPING A SPECIALITY.

Terms from 10d. per 1,000 words. Translations into and from all languages.

Trial Order Solicited.

Address: SECRETARY, as above.

### THE SIMPLE LIFE HOME (Sea View), 3, ALBANY ROAD, SOUTHPORT.

PRESS OPINIONS.  
Sheffield Telegraph: "Imagine a house spaciouly built and furnished with just those things which are needful for health, comfort, and the refinements of existence. Throughout simplicity and exquisite taste."  
Manchester City News: "Health and comfort carefully considered."  
Millgate Monthly: "Refinement, and the best in art and literature, make it an ideal house. We were amazed at the variety of food."  
Send to WARDEN for Prospectus.

### "THE UNITARIAN MONTHLY."

Magazine for Unitarian Propaganda. Adopted by churches with or without local page. Issued for last Sunday in each previous month. One copy post free, 14d.—1s. 6d. a year; 9d. per dozen; 3s. 6d. per 100; extra charge local page.—Address to EDITOR, The Parsonage, Mottram, Manchester.

### Situations, VACANT AND WANTED.

#### TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.

KYNOCH LIMITED have VACANCIES in their Commercial Department for a few YOUNG GENTLEMEN of good Education and Manners. No Premium required. Term of Indentures four years.—Apply by letter only to the Secretary, Kynoch Limited, Wotton, Birmingham.

LADY, experienced in Teaching and Secretarial Work, desires engagement. Highly recommended.—TALBOT, 51, Minster-road, West Hampstead, London.

LADY.—As HOUSEKEEPER. Special experience in household of a medical man.—Address, M., INQUIRER Office, 3, Essex-street, W.C.

LADY, as COMPANION, COMPANION-HOUSEKEEPER, or any position of trust and responsibility. Good references.—Address, Miss E. SMITH, c/o Mrs. Wills, Beacon Royal, West Cliff, Bournemouth.

WANTED, young PENSIONNAIRE, in French Professor's family for summer months. In Paris: during vacation the Auvergne mountains. Travelling expenses paid. 250 francs per month. English references.—PERRIER, 6, rue Nansouty, Parc Montsouris, Paris.

WANTED, very good PLAIN COOK, single-handed, only two in family, four servants kept. Also a good HOUSE-PALE-MAID for a gentleman in flat, two servants kept. And a very superior useful MAID, where three servants are kept, lady and gentleman, and little boy of four; good needlewoman. All very comfortable situations, close to Kensington Gardens.—Write in first instance, B., 96, Bishops-road, Bayswater.

LADY, living alone, wishes for COMPANION. Share expenses. Small house. Country town.—T. D., INQUIRER Office, 3, Essex-street, Strand, W.C.

CAN any Lady recommend a young HOUSEMAID, thoroughly trustworthy, and willing to help others. Wanted early in May.—The Misses BRUCE, 2, Talbot-square, W.

WANTED, a MAID ATTENDANT for an elderly lady, between 30 and 40. Cheerful and capable.—Apply, Miss COBB, Calthorpe, Reading.

### Schools, etc.

CHANNING HOUSE HIGH SCHOOL AND BOARDING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, HIGHGATE, LONDON, N. Head Mistress: Miss LILIAN TALBOT, B.A. Honours Lond. Preparation for London Matriculation, Trinity College, and Associated Board of Musicians. Healthysituation, Hockey, Cricket, and Swimming. Special terms for daughters of Unitarian ministers.—Apply to the HEAD MISTRESS.

### LETCHWORTH SCHOOL, LETCHWORTH, HERTS.

SCHOOL FOR BOYS, from six years upwards. Bracing air. Thorough all round, unsectarian education, without break, fitting for professional or other careers. Special regard to health and physical development. Delicate boys properly cared for.

Principal—J. H. N. Stephenson, M.A.

WAVERLEY SCHOOL, SHERWOOD RISE, NOTTINGHAM.—Head Master, Mr. H. T. FACON, B.A. Boarders. Home influence. Private field opposite school. Telephone. Ministers special terms. Re-open April 29.



## THE LATEST FOUNTAIN PEN, 1909 MODEL.

One of the leading manufacturers of Gold Fountain Pens challenges to demonstrate that their Pens are the very best, and have the largest sale, that no better article can be produced.

**They offer to give away 100,000 10/6 Diamond Star Fountain Pens, 1909 Model, for 2/6 each**

This Pen is fitted with 14-carat Solid Gold Nib, iridium pointed, making it practically everlasting, smooth, soft and easy writing and a pleasure to use. Twin Feed and Spiral to regulate the flow of ink, and all the latest improvements.

One of the letters we daily receive:—"It is by far the best of the kind I have ever used."



**THE SELF-FILLING AND SELF-CLEANING PERFECTION FOUNTAIN PEN** is a marvel of Simplicity; it deserves to be popular. It is non-leakable, fills itself in an instant, cleans itself in a moment—a press, a fill—and every part is guaranteed for two years. The Massive 14-carat Gold Nib is iridium-pointed, and will last for years, and improves in use. Fine, Medium, Broad, or J points can be had.

**This Marvellous Self-Filling Pen, worth 15/-, is offered as an advertisement for 5/6 each**

Is certain to be the Pen of the Future. Every Pen is guaranteed, and money will be returned if not fully satisfied. Any of our readers desiring a really genuine article cannot do better than write to the Makers.

**THE RED LION MANUFACTURING CO., LTD., 71, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON,**  
(Agents wanted.)

### Board and Residence.

**BOURNEMOUTH.**—Elvaston, West Cliff, BOARDING ESTABLISHMENT. unrivalled position on sea front, close to the High-cliffe Hotel. 50 rooms. Full-sized billiard tables. Lovely grounds, with access to Cliff Promenade-Due south. Near Unitarian Church. Illustrated Tariff.—Apply, Mrs. and Mr. POOOCK

**ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA.**—"Cran-tuck," 59, Warrior-square. First-class BOARD and RESIDENCE; most comfortable throughout. Sea View, excellent cuisine, billiard and smoke room, sanitary certificate.—Mr. and Mrs. SIDNEY P. POTTER.

**LANGLEY HOUSE, DAWLISH, S. DEVON.** Ladies as guests. Special advantages for girls visiting alone. Consumptives not admitted. From 35s. weekly.—Prospectus from Miss JONES.

**HAMPSTEAD (near TUBE).**—Guests received. Comfortable home; large house, garden; reasonable terms.—GUEST, c/o Bellis, Downshire-hill, N.W.

**LOW GREEN HOUSE, Thoraby, Aysgarth, S. O., Yorks.** Paying guests received. Lovely scenery.—Full particulars on application, enclosing stamped envelope to Miss SMITH.

**GRANGE-OVER-SANDS, LANCS.**—Miss ALICE E. PASSAVANT is prepared to receive paying guests on and after May 25, at 2, Newlands. Prospectus on application.

### LONDON, W.

**TWO LADIES RECEIVE OTHERS**—TEACHERS, STUDENTS and OTHER WORKERS, in their flat in Westbourne-square. References.—H. V. N., INQUIRER Office, 3, Essex-street, Strand, W.C.

## KINGSLEY HOTEL

(TEMPERANCE),

HART ST., BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, LONDON.  
Near the British Museum.

This well-appointed and commodious Hotel has passenger Lift; Electric Light in all Rooms; Bathrooms on every Floor; Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading, Smoking and Billiard Rooms, Lounge; All Floors Fireproof; Perfect Sanitation; Night Porter, Telephone. **Bedrooms** (including attendance) from 3s. 6d. to 6s. per night. Inclusive charge for Bedroom, Attendance, Table d'Hôte Breakfast and Dinner, from 2s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. per day.

Full Tariff and Testimonials on application.  
Telegraphic Address "Bookcraft," London.

Telegrams: "Platefuls, London."

Telephone: 3399 Gerrard.

## THE NEWTON HOTEL, HIGH HOLBORN.

Opposite British Museum Station. 12 minutes' walk from the City Temple. The centre of the Tube Railways, Shops, and Amusements. Handsome public rooms. Electric light throughout. Room, bath, and breakfast, 4s. 6d. Inclusive terms, £2 2s. per week.

Personal Supervision of Proprietresses.

### BOOKS OF LIBERAL RELIGION.

Crown 8vo, pp. 82, 1s. net, by post 1s. 2d.

#### MORNING PRAYERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF A BELIEVER IN GOD.

By FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.

"They bear everywhere the mark of devout thoughtfulness. Moreover, they are so entirely free from doctrinal technicalities and sectarian suggestiveness that people of all shades of belief can helpfully make them their own. This new edition is by all means to be welcomed."—*Christian World*.

Crown 8vo, pp. 520, 3s. net, by post 3s. 4d.

#### THE SOUL OF THE BIBLE.

Selected passages from the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha arranged as synthetic readings in Biblical order.

By ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE.

Introduction by EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

Crown 8vo., pp. 178, 2/6 net, by post 2/9.

#### THE CHURCH OF TO-DAY.

By JOSEPH H. CROOKER, D.D.

"A remarkably well written, well considered, well reasoned 'plea' for the due appreciation of 'the church' as an organisation naturally fitted to meet human needs that are fundamental and universal; an essential factor in the corporate life of communities, and to-day not less but more needed than ever."—*Chicago Tribune*.

BOOK ROOM, Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, W.O.

### JOHN PAGE HOPPS' MONTHLY.

## THE COMING DAY.

ENLARGED. PRICE THREEPENCE.

#### Contents for MAY.

Suicide: "Tired of Life."  
Jesus and the Sword.  
The Carlyle Love Letters.  
Pit Ponies.  
A New Dispensation.  
Irish Patriot Memories.  
The Navy League and Free Trade.  
The British Patriot.  
Beneficial Poisons.  
Notes by the Way and Notes on Books.  
Crutches for the Month.

A. C. FIFIELD, 44, Fleet-street,  
and all Booksellers.

**TABLECLOTHS!** Snowy Irish Linen, pure flax, lifelong wear, 54 inches square, 3/3. Handkerchiefs, Irish Linen, hemstitched borders: Ladies' 2/6 dozen; Gentlemen's 3/9. Postages 3d. Patterns free.—HUTTON'S, 5, Larne, Ireland.

**SPRING COSTUMES!** Make yours with "FLAXZELLA" (Irish Linen). Lovely colours, new art shades; makes up exquisitely. Washable, durable; plain, striped or embroidered, 7½d. yard. Patterns free.—HUTTON'S, 5, Larne, Ireland.

**DARTMOOR.**—A well-built, prettily and newly furnished 7-roomed HOUSE TO LET for the summer. Stands 800 ft., close to high Tors, station, and 35 minutes from Plymouth. Four good bed-rooms, bath room (hot and cold water). Golf and fishing within easy distance.—Apply, Miss MATTHEY, Auckland, Victoria-park, Manchester.

## E. Norman Reed & Co.,



Artists  
in  
Stained  
&  
Leaded  
Glass.

Memorial  
Windows.

Mosaics.

### Church Decorators.

13, Lisle Street, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Under the direction of Geo. G. LAIDLER.

**BLACK STOCKINGS** for 1/3 post free from the knitters.—All pure wool, medium weight. 3 pairs 3/6. Gentlemen's socks, same price. Write to-day. State size boots. Money back if desired.—CLARK, 18, Clarence-street, York.

### 19TH CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY, ADELAIDE PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE.

#### DIRECTORS.

Chairman—SIR ALEXANDER WALDEMAR LAWRENCE, Bart.

Deputy-Chairman—MARK H. JUDGE, A.R.I.B.A.

SIR WILLIAM CHANCE, F.H.A. HARCASTLE, Bart. F.S.I.

Miss CECIL GRADWELL. Miss ORME.

STEPHEN SEAWARD TAYLER.

A SAFE AND SOUND INVESTMENT FOR LARGE OR SMALL SUMS.

**Save 5/- Monthly.** Subscription Preference Shares of £20 each are issued suitable for small investors. Payable 5/- monthly and they receive 4 per cent. interest.

Preference Shares of £10 each now receive 4 per cent. interest free of income tax.

Deposits received at 3 and 3½ per cent. free of income tax.

Investments are withdrawable at any time on short notice.

Repayments, Survey Fees, and Law Charges low. Prospectus free.

CHARLES A. PRICE, Manager.

### Terms for Advertisements.

Advertisements for THE INQUIRER should be addressed to the PUBLISHER, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C., and should reach the office not later than Twelve o'clock on THURSDAY, to appear the same week. The scale of charges is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
PER PAGE .. .. .	6	0	0
HALF-PAGE .. .. .	3	0	0
PER COLUMN... .. .	2	0	0
INCH IN COLUMN .. .. .	0	3	6

Special Terms for a Series.

Calendar Notices, 10s. per year, 2 lines.

Births, Marriages, Deaths, 6d. per line. Minimum charge, 1/6

Situations Vacant and Wanted,

20 words, 1s.; 30 words, 1s. 6d.; 40 words, 2s.

Second insertion and after, half price.

All payments in respect to THE INQUIRER to be made to E. KENNEDY, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C. The entire remittance should accompany all orders to insert Advertisements.

Printed by UNWIN BROTHERS, LTD., 27, Pilgrim-street, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors by E. KENNEDY, at the Office, 3, Essex-street Strand, London, W.C. Sole Agent, JOHN HEYWOOD, 20 to 28, Lamb Conduit-street, W.C. Manchester (Wholesale), JOHN HEYWOOD, Deansgate.—Saturday, May 1, 1909.